arXiv:1511.01699v1 [cs.CC] 5 Nov 2015

On Low Rank Approximation of Binary Matrices

Chen Dan*[1], Kristoffer Arnsfelt Hansen†[2], He Jiang‡[1], Liwei Wang§[1], and Yuchen Zhou¶[3]

[1]Key Laboratory of Machine Perception, School of EECS, Peking University
[2]Department of Computer Science, Aarhus University
[3]Key Laboratory of Machine Perception, School of Mathematics, Peking University

Abstract

We consider the problem of low rank approximation of binary matrices. Here we are given a $d \times n$ binary matrix $\mathbf{A}$ and a small integer $k < d$. The goal is to find two binary matrices $\mathbf{U}$ and $\mathbf{V}$ of sizes $d \times k$ and $k \times n$ respectively, so that the Frobenius norm of $\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{UV}$ is minimized. There are two models of this problem, depending on the definition of the product of binary matrices: The GF(2) model and the Boolean semiring model. Previously, the only known results are 2-approximation algorithms for the special case $k = 1$ [21, 12] (where the two models are equivalent).

In this paper, we give the *first* results for the general case $k > 1$ for both GF(2) and Boolean model. For the GF(2) model, we show that a simple column-selection algorithm achieves $O(k)$-approximation. For the Boolean model, we develop a new algorithm and show that it is $O(2^k)$-approximation. For constant k, both algorithms run in polynomial time in the size of the matrix. We also show that the low rank binary matrix approximation problem is NP-hard even for $k = 1$, solving a conjecture in [14].

*Email: chen_dan@pku.edu.cn
†Email: arnsfelt@cs.au.dk
‡Email: hejiang@pku.edu.cn
§Email: wanglw@cis.pku.edu.cn
¶Email: yuchen_zhou@pku.edu.cn

1 Introduction

Low rank approximation of matrices is a classical problem. Given a matrix $\mathbf{A}$ of size $d \times n$, the goal is to find two low rank matrices $\mathbf{U}$ and $\mathbf{V}$, such that $\mathbf{UV}$ approximates A. Formally, the problem is to solve

$$\min_{\mathbf{U},\mathbf{V}} \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{UV}\|_F^2, \tag{1}$$

where the minimum is over all matrices $\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}$ of sizes $d \times k$ and $k \times n$ respectively; and k, typically a small integer, is the desired rank. Here the error is measured in terms of the Frobenius norm $\|\cdot\|_F$.

In many applications, $\mathbf{A}$ is a data matrix. Each column of $\mathbf{A}$ is a d-dimensional data vector, and each row of $\mathbf{A}$ corresponds to an attribute. Low rank approximation of $\mathbf{A}$ is often called factor analysis and dimensionality reduction: the k columns of the matrix $\mathbf{U}$ are the factors and basis vectors of the low dimensional space, and each column of $\mathbf{V}$ contains the combination coefficients.

If $\mathbf{A}$, $\mathbf{U}$, $\mathbf{V}$ are matrices over reals, low rank approximation can be efficiently solved by Singular Value Decomposition (SVD). This problem has been studied for more than a century, and is known as Principal Component Analysis (PCA) [11], Karhunen-Loève Transform [13], to name a few.

In this paper we consider low rank approximation of binary matrices. This is motivated by the fact that in many applications data are binary (categorical) rather than continuous. In the binary case, we require both data matrix $\mathbf{A}$ and the rank-k matrices $\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}$ are binary. There are two formulations of the binary low rank approximation problem, depending on the definition of vector inner production. One formulation will be referred to as GF(2) model, in which the inner product of two binary vectors $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}$ is defined as $\mathbf{u}^T\mathbf{v} := \oplus_i u_i v_i$. The other formulation will be referred to as *Boolean* model, in which the inner product is defined as $\mathbf{u}^T\mathbf{v} := \bigvee_i (u_i \wedge v_i)$.

The Boolean model is usually called Boolean Factor Analysis (BFA). It has found numerous applications in machine learning and data mining including latent variable analysis, topic models, association rule mining, clustering, and database tiling [4, 16, 25, 20, 22]. Belohlavek and Vychodil [4] study BFA for the case of exact factorization of $\mathbf{A}$, i.e., $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{UV}$ with the Boolean rank of $\mathbf{U}$, $\mathbf{V}$ as small as possible. They give a characterization of this problem via Formal Concept Analysis and develop a greedy algorithm. For low rank approximation problem, which is more useful in practice, there exist many heuristic algorithms [16, 8, 15, 7]. However, to our knowledge, there is no theoretical guarantee for any of these algorithms.

For the GF(2) model of low rank approximation, we are not aware of any existing works. But a related line of research, Independent Component Analysis (ICA) over GF(2) has received increasing attention in the signal processing field [27, 9, 18].

In this paper, we consider binary rank-k approximation problem formally stated as follows. Given $\mathbf{A} \in \{0,1\}^{d \times n}$,

$$\min_{\mathbf{U} \in \{0,1\}^{d \times k}, \mathbf{V} \in \{0,1\}^{k \times n}} \|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{UV}\|_F^2. \tag{2}$$

where the matrix product $\mathbf{UV}$ is over GF(2) and Boolean semiring respectively.

Previously, the only known theoretical result of this problem is that for the special case of $k = 1$ (for which the GF(2) and the Boolean model are equivalent), there are 2-approximation algorithms. We will describe these algorithms in detail in Section 1.2.

The computational complexity of the low rank approximation problem is also far from fully understood. For the rank-1 case, Tan showed that the equivalent Maximum

Edge Weight Biclique problem for $\{-1, 1\}$-matrices is NP-hard under *randomized* reductions [24]. In the case when the rank k is unrestricted (i.e. part of the input) deciding whether there exist $\mathbf{U}$ and $\mathbf{V}$ such that $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{UV}$ in the Boolean semiring model is precisely the NP-complete Minimal Set Basis problem [23], and that immediately implies that the approximation problem is NP-hard to approximate wihtin *any* factor, as noted by Miettinen [17]. On the other hand, this does not imply hardness when $k \ll d, n$. Indeed, the Minimal Set Basis problem is fixed-parameter tractable with parameter k, by a simple kernelization algorithm [6]. Note also that in the GF(2) model, deciding the existence of $\mathbf{U}$ and $\mathbf{V}$ such that $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{UV}$ is efficiently solvable using Gaussian elimination, regardless of the rank k being unrestricted.

1.1 Our Results and the Approach

In this paper, we provide the first theoretical results for binary low rank approximation for $k > 1$. For the GF(2) model, we show that a simple column-selection algorithm achieves $O(k)$-approximation. For the Boolean model, we develop a new algorithm and show that it is $O(2^k)$-approximation. For constant k, both algorithms run in polynomial time in the size of the matrix.

GF(2) Model: Our first result is an algorithm for the GF(2) model. We show that the algorithm achieves $(\frac{k}{2} + 1 + \frac{k}{2(2^k-1)})$-approximation (Theorem 1). For $k = 1$ this is 2-approximation, the same as previous results for this special case [21, 12]. We also show the bound is tight for the algorithm in the sense that for every k and every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a binary matrix $\mathbf{A}$, such that the approximation ratio of the algorithm is at least $\frac{k}{2} + 1 + \frac{k}{2(2^k-1)} - \epsilon$ (Theorem 2).

The algorithm is very simple. We simply choose the best k columns from matrix $\mathbf{A}$ and form the basis matrix. Here best means the approximation error induced by the resulting basis matrix is minimal among all k columns of $\mathbf{A}$.

The main effort is to show that the algorithm achieves $(\frac{k}{2}+1+\frac{k}{2(2^k-1)})$-approximation. Here we give a high level description. Consider the problem given in Eq.(2). Throughout this paper, we will call the left matrix $\mathbf{U}$ the basis matrix, as its column vectors are the basis of the low dimensional space; and the right matrix $\mathbf{V}$ the coefficient matrix, as its columns contain the linear combination coefficients. Let $\mathbf{U}$ and $\mathbf{V}$ be an optimal solution of Eq.(2). Let $\mathbf{u_1}, \ldots, \mathbf{u_k}$ be the k columns of $\mathbf{U}$. For each column $\mathbf{u}_i$ of the optimal basis matrix $\mathbf{U}$, consider its nearest neighbor among all the columns of $\mathbf{A}$. Let $\mathbf{a}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{a}_n$ be the n columns of $\mathbf{A}$. Denote by $\mathbf{a}_{(\mathbf{u}_i)}$ the nearest neighbor column of $\mathbf{u}_i$ in $\mathbf{A}$. Given an optimal basis matrix $\mathbf{U}$, we thus have a matrix $\mathbf{A}_{(\mathbf{U})} := (\mathbf{a}_{(\mathbf{u}_1)}, \ldots, \mathbf{a}_{(\mathbf{u}_k)})$, consisting of columns of $\mathbf{A}$. Note that the optimal solution of Eq.(2) is not unique. In fact, fixing an optimal basis matrix $\mathbf{U}$, for every matrix $\mathbf{B} = (\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_k)$, $\mathbf{b}_i \in \{0, 1\}^k$, if the rank of $\mathbf{B}$ is k over GF(2), then $(\mathbf{UB}, \mathbf{B}^{-1}\mathbf{V})$ must be an optimal solution also. Each optimal basis matrix $\mathbf{UB}$ induces a nearest neighbor matrix $\mathbf{A}_{(\mathbf{UB})}$. We will show that there must exist a rank k matrix $\mathbf{B}$ such that the induced nearest neighbor matrix $\mathbf{A}_{(\mathbf{UB})}$, which when used as basis matrix, achieves an approximation error at most $(\frac{k}{2} + 1 + \frac{k}{2(2^k-1)})$ times that of the optimal solution $(\mathbf{UB}, \mathbf{B}^{-1}\mathbf{V})$. Let $\mathrm{Err}(\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_k)$ be the approximation error associated with the basis matrix $\mathbf{A}_{(\mathbf{UB})}$ for $\mathbf{B} = (\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_k)$. Our goal is to bound the following.

$$\min_{\mathbf{b}_1,\ldots,\mathbf{b}_k} \mathrm{Err}(\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_k), \tag{3}$$

where $\mathbf{b}_i \in \{0, 1\}^k$ for all $i \in [k]$.

Directly bounding Eq.(3) is prohibitive. The approach we take is to consider a sequence of $k+1$ error minimization problems. For the rth ($0 \le r \le k$) minimization, we only optimize r vectors among $\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_k$ and keep the other $k-r$ vectors fixed. Given $\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_k$, let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Err}^{(0)}(\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_k) &:= \mathrm{Err}(\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_k), & (4) \\ \mathrm{Err}^{(r)}(\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r}) &:= \min_{\mathbf{b} \in \{0,1\}^k} \mathrm{Err}^{(r-1)}(\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r}, \mathbf{b}), & (5) \\ \mathrm{Err}^{(k)}() &:= \min_{\mathbf{b} \in \{0,1\}^k} \mathrm{Err}^{(k-1)}(\mathbf{b}), & (6) \end{aligned}$$

Then $\mathrm{Err}^{(k)}()$ is equivalent to Eq.(3).

Although the final goal is to bound the *ratio* between $\mathrm{Err}^{(k)}()$ and the error of the optimal solution of Eq.(2), we instead prove *additive* bounds for $\mathrm{Err}^{(r)}(\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r})$ for all $0 \le r \le k$. To be more precise, let OPT_k be the error of the optimal solution of Eq.(2), we will show that $\mathrm{Err}^{(r)}(\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r})$ is bounded by OPT_k plus a term depending on r and $\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r}$ (Theorem 4). The point is that when $r = k$, this additive bound becomes a multiplicative bound with respect to OPT_k and is the ratio we want. The reason for introducing $\mathrm{Err}^{(0)}, \ldots, \mathrm{Err}^{(k-1)}$ is that we need to use the relation between $\mathrm{Err}^{(r)}$ and $\mathrm{Err}^{(r-1)}$ to prove the bound. Actually the additive bound is proved by mathematical induction on r.

Although the relation of $\mathrm{Err}^{(r)}$ and $\mathrm{Err}^{(r-1)}$ is

$$\mathrm{Err}^{(r)}(\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r}) = \min_{\mathbf{b}} \mathrm{Err}^{(r-1)}(\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r}, \mathbf{b}),$$

directly optimizing $\mathbf{b}$ is very difficult. Our idea is to use *weighted averaging*. Since for each $\mathbf{b} \in \{0,1\}^k$, $\mathrm{Err}^{(r)}(\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r}) \le \mathrm{Err}^{(r-1)}(\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r}, \mathbf{b})$, we have that for any set of weights $w_{\mathbf{b}}$ such that $w_{\mathbf{b}} \ge 0$ and $\sum_{\mathbf{b}} w_{\mathbf{b}} = 1$, $\mathrm{Err}^{(r)}(\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r}) \le \sum_{\mathbf{b}} w_{\mathbf{b}} \mathrm{Err}^{(r-1)}(\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r}, \mathbf{b})$. We carefully choose the weights $w_{\mathbf{b}}$ to get a small upper bound. We conduct two layers of weighted averaging. Consider the quotient space $\mathrm{GF}(2)^k / \mathrm{span}(\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r})$ and the coset $[\mathbf{b}] := \mathbf{b} + \mathrm{span}(\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r})$. In the first layer, we perform weighted averaging within each coset $[\mathbf{b}]$, and obtain a bound for $\mathrm{Err}^{(r)}$ depending on the coset. In the second layer we average over all cosets using another set of weights. We need different rules to set the weights in the two layers. Within a coset $[\mathbf{b}]$, we choose the weights as follows. Let $\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}$ be the already fixed optimal solution of Eq.(2). For each $\mathbf{c} \in [\mathbf{b}]$, let $n_{\mathbf{c}}$ denote the number of columns of $\mathbf{V}$ that are equal to $\mathbf{c}$. The weight we assign to $\mathbf{c}$ is proportional to $n_{\mathbf{c}}$. For the second layer, let $n_{[\mathbf{b}]} := \sum_{\mathbf{c} \in [\mathbf{b}]} n_{\mathbf{c}}$ be the total number of columns of $\mathbf{V}$ that belong to the coset $[\mathbf{b}]$. We assign the weight to a coset $[\mathbf{b}]$ as follows. If $[\mathbf{b}] = \mathrm{span}(\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r})$ then the weight is set to be zero. Otherwise, we assign the weight to $[\mathbf{b}]$ proportional to $\frac{n_{[\mathbf{b}]}}{\sum_{[\mathbf{b}]} n_{[\mathbf{b}]} - \lambda n_{[\mathbf{b}]}}$ for a constant λ depending on r. Combining the two layers of averaging we obtain the additive bound and that implies the desired approximation ratio.

The lower bound is proved by explicit construction. We construct a matrix which is approximately low rank in the sense that it is the product of two rank-k matrix plus a very sparse matrix. The two rank-k matrices have special structures so that the approximation ratio of the column-selection algorithm cannot be smaller than $\frac{k}{2} + 1 + \frac{k}{2(2^k - 1)}$ significantly.

Boolean Model: We present a new algorithm for the Boolean rank-k approximation problem. It turns out that the Boolean model is more difficult. Our algorithm achieves

$(2^{k-1}+1)$-approximation, and the running time is $O((2^k+2)!(n^{2^k})d)$. The algorithm is different from that of the GF(2) case and is complicated. The main difficulty is that the Boolean semiring does not have the good structure of GF(2). For the Boolean model, given an optimal basis matrix $\mathbf{U}$ and a matrix $\mathbf{B} = (\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_k)$ ($\mathbf{b}_i \in \{0,1\}^k$) whose Boolean rank is k, $\mathbf{UB}$ is no longer an optimal basis matrix in general (here $\mathbf{UB}$ is Boolean product). More seriously, using $\mathbf{UB}$ as the basis matrix the approximation ratio can be arbitrarily large as the size of $\mathbf{A}$ grows, because, for example, $\mathbf{u}_2$ cannot be even approximately recovered from $\mathbf{u}_1$ and $\mathbf{u}_1 \vee \mathbf{u}_2$ (bit-wise OR).

Our idea is to use all 2^k linear combinations of the columns of $\mathbf{U}$ to construct the k basis vectors. Let $(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})$ be an optimal solution of the Boolean low rank approximation problem. Let $\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_{2^k-1}$ be the $2^k - 1$ non-zero vectors in $\{0,1\}^k$. We consider the nearest neighbor columns of $\mathbf{Ub}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{Ub}_{2^k-1}$ in $\mathbf{A}$, which are denoted by $\mathbf{a}_{(\mathbf{Ub}_1)}, \ldots, \mathbf{a}_{(\mathbf{Ub}_{2^k-1})}$. Each column of the basis matrix is constructed by a Boolean combination of $\mathbf{a}_{(\mathbf{Ub}_1)}, \ldots, \mathbf{a}_{(\mathbf{Ub}_{2^k-1})}$. Our construction has a decomposition property: Let $\mathbf{b}_{(1)}, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_{(2^k-1)}$ be an ordering of $\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_{2^k-1}$ so that $n_{\mathbf{b}_{(1)}} \geq n_{\mathbf{b}_{(2)}} \geq \ldots \geq n_{\mathbf{b}_{(2^k-1)}}$; Also let $\tilde{\mathbf{U}} = (\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1, \ldots, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k)$ be the basis matrix we construct. Then for every $i \in [2^k-1]$ the distance between $\mathbf{Ub}_{(i)}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{U}}\mathbf{b}_{(i)}$ can be bounded by the sum of the distance between $\mathbf{Ub}_{(j)}$ and $\mathbf{a}_{(\mathbf{Ub}_{(j)})}$ for all $j \geq i$. This allows us to bound the approximation ratio. The concrete construction is described in Section 3.

Finally we study the hardness of the binary low rank approximation problem. We show that the problem is NP-hard for $k = 1$ under polynomial (deterministic) time reduction, thus improving the consequence of the result by Tan [24] as well as solving the conjecture proposed in [14].

1.2 Related Works

To our knowledge, all known theoretical results on the low rank approximation problem are about the special case of rank-one, i.e., $k = 1$. In the rank-one case, one looks for binary vectors $\mathbf{u}$, $\mathbf{v}$ such that $\|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{uv}^T\|_F$ is minimized.

Shen et al. [21] formulate the rank-one problem as Integer Linear Programming (ILP). They showed that solving its LP relaxation yields a 2-approximation. They also improved the efficiency by reducing the LP to a Max-Flow problem using a technique developed in [10].

Jiang et al. [12] observed that for the rank-one case, simply choosing the best column from $\mathbf{A}$ yields a 2-approximation. To see this, let $\mathbf{u}^*$ be the optimal $\mathbf{u}$ such that $\|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{uv}^T\|_F$ is minimized for some $\mathbf{v}$. Let $i^* = \min_{i \in [n]} \|\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbf{u}^*\|_F$, where $\mathbf{A}_i$ is the ith column of $\mathbf{A}$; so $\mathbf{A}_{i^*}$ is the column of $\mathbf{A}$ closest to $\mathbf{u}^*$. Now, for any $i \in [n]$, $\|\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbf{A}_{i^*}\|_F \leq \|\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbf{u}^*\|_F + \|\mathbf{A}_{i^*} - \mathbf{u}^*\|_F \leq 2\|\mathbf{A}_i - \mathbf{u}^*\|_F$. It follows that using $\mathbf{A}_{i^*}$ as the basis vector induces a loss at most twice as that of using $\mathbf{u}^*$. Jiang et al. also generalize this method to solve another matrix factorization problem for $k > 1$. The problem is to factorize $\mathbf{A}$ into $\mathbf{UV}$, but under the constraint that each column of $\mathbf{V}$ contains at most one 1. Put it another way, they try to approximate each column of $\mathbf{A}$ using a single column of $\mathbf{U}$ rather than using a combination of the columns of $\mathbf{U}$. However, [12] does not provide any theoretical analysis of this algorithm for $k > 1$.

In the GF(2) model, low rank approximation is related to the concept of matrix rigidity introduced by Valiant [26], as a method of proving lower bounds for linear circuits. For a matrix $\mathbf{A}$ over GF(2), the rigidity $R_{\mathbf{A}}(k)$ is the smallest number of entries of $\mathbf{A}$ that must be changed in order to bring its rank down to k. Thus for a $d \times n$ matrix $\mathbf{A}$, $R_{\mathbf{A}}(k)$ is *precisely* the minimum approximation error possible by a product of a $d \times k$ matrix $\mathbf{U}$ and a $k \times n$ matrix $\mathbf{V}$. By the results of Valiant, an $n \times n$ matrix $\mathbf{A}$ for

which $R_{\mathbf{A}}(k) \geq n^{1+\varepsilon}$, for $k = O(n/\log\log n)$ and for some constant $\varepsilon > 0$ cannot be computed by a linear circuit of size $O(n)$ and depth $O(\log n)$. Such rigid matrices exists in abundance – the challenge is to come up with an explicit construction of a family of rigid matrices. For the low rank approximation problem we are however interested in the setting of $k \ll n$ and we are interested in algorithms rather than explicit matrices. Thus there appear to be no direct connection to this besides the related definitions.

2 Low Rank Approximation of Matrices Over GF(2)

In this section we consider the GF(2) model. We first describe the algorithm and then state the theorems for the approximation ratio. The proofs of the technical results appear in the appendix.

The algorithm for the GF(2) model is very simple, and will be referred to as the column-selection algorithm. The algorithm works as follows: Let k be the desired rank. For every k columns of matrix $\mathbf{A}$, we form a basis matrix $\mathbf{P}$, and then calculate the corresponding coefficient matrix $\mathbf{Q}$. Each column of $\mathbf{Q}$ can be obtained by searching over all 2^k vectors in $\{0,1\}^k$. (Computing a column of $\mathbf{Q}$ is known as the Nearest Codeword Problem[1].) Finally, $(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{Q})$ with the smallest approximation error is returned as the solution. It can be seen that the running time of the column-selection algorithm is $\binom{n}{k} n 2^k d = O(n^{k+1} d)$.

The following theorem states that column-selection is a $\left(\frac{k}{2} + 1 + \frac{k}{2(2^k-1)}\right)$-approximation algorithm.

Theorem 1 *For $\forall k \geq 1$, let OPT_k be the error of the optimal solution of Eq.(2). Then the error of the column-selection algorithm is no more than $\left(\frac{k}{2} + 1 + \frac{k}{2(2^k-1)}\right) \cdot \mathrm{OPT}_k$.*

Moreover, we show that the approximation ratio $\left(\frac{k}{2} + 1 + \frac{k}{2(2^k-1)}\right)$ is tight for the column-selection algorithm.

Theorem 2 *For $\forall k \geq 1$ and $\forall \epsilon > 0$, there exists a matrix $\mathbf{A}$ such that the error of the output the column-selection algorithm is at least $\left(\frac{k}{2} + 1 + \frac{k}{2(2^k-1)} - \epsilon\right) \cdot \mathrm{OPT}_k$.*

As described in Introduction, the idea of the proof of Theorem 1 is to consider all equivalent optimal basis matrices of the problem. That is, for a fixed optimal basis matrix $\mathbf{U}$, we look at $\mathbf{UB}$ for all $\mathbf{B} = (\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_k)$ of full rank and the basis matrix formed by the nearest neighbor columns of $\mathbf{Ub}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{Ub}_k$, namely, $\mathbf{P} = (\mathbf{a}_{(\mathbf{Ub})_1}, \ldots, \mathbf{a}_{(\mathbf{Ub})_k})$. The approximation error induced by $\mathbf{P}$ is denoted by $\mathrm{Err}(\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_k)$. We will show that $\min_{\mathbf{b}_1,\ldots,\mathbf{b}_k} \mathrm{Err}(\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_k)$ is bounded by $\left(\frac{k}{2} + 1 + \frac{k}{2(2^k-1)}\right) \mathrm{OPT}_k$ where OPT_k is the error of the optimal solution. The approximation ratio is proved by establishing a series of $k+1$ additive bounds on the approximation error, each optimize r $(0 \leq r \leq k)$ $\mathbf{b}_i$ and let all the other $k-r$ $\mathbf{b}_i$ fixed. When $r = k$ the additive bound becomes a multiplicative bound and proves the approximation ratio.

[1]The Nearest Codeword Problem is NP-hard to approximate within any constant factor and is quasi-NP-hard to approximate within $2^{\log^{1-\varepsilon} d}$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$ [3]. There is randomized polynomial time $O(k/\log d)$-approximation algorithm by Berman and Karpinski [5], and there is a deterministic algorithm with the same approximation ratio in near polynomial time by Alon, Panigrahy, and Yekhanin [1]. In our algorithm we simply do exhaustive search for computing the columns of $\mathbf{Q}$ as for dimensionality reduction problem k is typically a small integer.

The additive bounds are stated in Theorem 4, which is technical. Below we first describe the notions appeared in Theorem 4. These notions are frequently used in the proof as well. For clarity, we list the notions in two tables.

Definition 3 *Let* $\mathbf{A}$ *be the matrix to be approximated and* $(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})$ *be a fixed optimal solution of the problem in Eq.(2). For* $\mathbf{u} \in \{0,1\}^d$, $\mathbf{c} \in \{0,1\}^k$, *and* $\mathcal{X} \subset \{0,1\}^k$*:*

Definition	Explanation
$\mathbf{a}_{(\mathbf{u})}$	The nearest neighbor of $\mathbf{u}$ among the columns of $\mathbf{A}$ (If more than one nearest neighbor, choose one arbitrarily.)
$\mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{c}} := \{j \in [n] : \mathbf{V}_j = \mathbf{c}\}$	The set of columns of $\mathbf{V}$ that are equal to vector $\mathbf{c}$.
$n_{\mathbf{c}} := \lvert\mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{c}}\rvert$	The number of columns of $\mathbf{V}$ that are equal to $\mathbf{c}$.
$L_{\mathbf{c}} := \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{c}}} \lvert\mathbf{a}_j - \mathbf{U}\mathbf{c}\rvert$	The total approximation error of those columns in $\mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{c}}$.
$N_{\mathcal{X}} := \sum_{\mathbf{c} \in \mathcal{X}} n_{\mathbf{c}}$	The total number of columns of $\mathbf{V}$ that belong to set $\mathcal{X}$.
$M_{\mathbf{c}} = \begin{cases} \frac{L_{\mathbf{c}}}{n_{\mathbf{c}}} & n_{\mathbf{c}} > 0 \\ d & n_{\mathbf{c}} = 0 \end{cases}$	Upper bound of the average error of the columns in $\mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{c}}$.

Table 1: Definitions for errors and nearest neighbors

For $1 \le r \le k$ *and linear independent vectors* $\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_r$ *in* $\{0,1\}^k$*:*

Definition	Explanation
$\mathrm{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_r) := \{0,1\}^k \setminus \mathrm{span}(\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_r)$	Complement of $\mathrm{span}(\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_r)$.
$\mathrm{span}^{\setminus i}(\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_r) := \mathrm{span}(\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_{i-1}, \mathbf{b}_{i+1}, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_r)$	Span of all vectors except the ith.

Table 2: Definitions for vector spans.

Now we can state the additive bounds.

Theorem 4 *Let* $\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_k$ *be* k *linear independent vectors in* $\{0,1\}^k$*. Then for each* $0 \le r \le k$*,*

$$\mathrm{Err}^r(\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r}) \le \mathrm{OPT}_k + \lambda_r \cdot \sum_{\mathbf{c} \in \mathrm{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r})} L_{\mathbf{c}} + \sum_{i=1}^{k-r} f_i(\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r}) M_{\mathbf{b}_i}, \quad (7)$$

where $M_{\mathbf{b}_i}$ *has been defined in Definition 3, and*

$$\lambda_r = \begin{cases} 0 & r = 0 \\ \frac{r}{2}\left(1 + \frac{1}{2^r - 1}\right), & 1 \le r \le k \end{cases}$$

and

$$f_i(\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r}) = N_{\mathcal{X}} + \frac{1}{2} N_{\mathcal{Y}}, \quad (8)$$

here $\mathcal{X} = \mathbf{b}_i + \mathrm{span}^{\setminus i}(\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r})$*, and* $\mathcal{Y} = \mathrm{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r})$*.*

Theorem 1 follows from Theorem 4 immediately.

Proof of Theorem 1

Let $r = k$ in Theorem 4. Then the last term in the RHS of Eq.(7) vanishes. The second term in the RHS of Eq.(7) becomes $\lambda_k \cdot \sum_{\mathbf{c} \in \{0,1\}^k} L_{\mathbf{c}}$. Observe that $\sum_{\mathbf{c} \in \{0,1\}^k} L_{\mathbf{c}} = \mathrm{OPT}_k$ and $1 + \lambda_k = \frac{k}{2} + 1 + \frac{k}{2(2^k - 1)}$, the theorem follows. □

We are now going to prove Theorem 4. First we need a simple lemma.

Lemma 5 *Let $a_1, \cdots, a_n$ and λ be non-negative real numbers. Let $S := \sum_{i=1}^n a_i$. If $S > \lambda a_i$ for all $i \in [n]$, then*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{a_i}{S - \lambda a_i} \geq \frac{n}{n - \lambda}. \tag{9}$$

Proof By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have $\sum_{i=1}^n (S-\lambda a_i) \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{S-\lambda a_i} \geq n^2$. Taking into consideration that $\sum_{i=1}^n (S-\lambda a_i) = (n-\lambda)S$, we have $\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{S}{S-\lambda a_i} \geq \frac{n^2}{n-\lambda}$. Observing that $\frac{S}{S-\lambda a_i} = 1 + \lambda \frac{a_i}{S-\lambda a_i}$, we further have $n + \lambda \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{a_i}{S-\lambda a_i} \geq \frac{n^2}{n-\lambda}$. The Lemma follows from simple manipulations. □

We also note that $M_{\mathbf{c}}$ is an upper bound for the approximation error of $\mathbf{a}_{(\mathbf{Uc})}$ by $\mathbf{Uc}$, as stated in the following lemma.

Lemma 6 *For any $\mathbf{c} \in \{0,1\}^k$, $|\mathbf{a}_{(\mathbf{Uc})} - \mathbf{Uc}| \leq M_{\mathbf{c}}$*

Proof If $n_{\mathbf{c}} = 0$, then the lemma is true since $(\mathbf{a}_{(\mathbf{Uc})} - \mathbf{Uc}) \in \{0,1\}^d$. If $n_{\mathbf{c}} > 0$, recall that $\mathbf{a}_{(\mathbf{Uc})}$ is the nearest neighbor of $\mathbf{Uc}$ among the columns of $\mathbf{A}$, and $L_{\mathbf{c}}$ is the total error of $n_{\mathbf{c}}$ columns. Therefore $|\mathbf{a}_{(\mathbf{Uc})} - \mathbf{Uc}| \leq \frac{L_{\mathbf{c}}}{n_{\mathbf{c}}}$. □

Proof of Theorem 4

We prove the theorem by mathematical induction on r. Throughout the proof we will fix an optimal solution $(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})$ for the Binary low rank problem Eq.(2).

Base Case

We first prove inequality Eq.(7) for $r = 0$. Observe that in this case, $\lambda_0 = 0$ and $f_i(\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_k) = N_{\mathbf{b}_i + \mathrm{span}^{\setminus i}(\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_k)}$. Thus it suffices to show

$$\mathrm{Err}^{(0)}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_k) \leq \mathrm{OPT}_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k} M_{\mathbf{b}_i} N_{\mathbf{b}_i + \mathrm{span}^{\setminus i}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_k)}.$$

Recall that $\mathrm{Err}^{(0)}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_k) = \mathrm{Err}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_k)$, and $\mathrm{Err}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_k)$ is the approximation error of using $\mathbf{A}_{(\mathbf{UB})} = (\mathbf{a}_{(\mathbf{Ub}_1)}, \ldots, \mathbf{a}_{(\mathbf{Ub}_k)})$ as the basis matrix, where $\mathbf{a}_{(\mathbf{Ub}_i)}$ is the nearest neighbor of $\mathbf{Ub}_i$ among the columns of $\mathbf{A}$.

The total approximation error $\mathrm{Err}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_k)$ is the sum of the error for each column $\mathbf{a}_j$. Let $\mathbf{b} \in \{0,1\}^k$. Because $\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_k$ are linear independent in $\mathrm{GF}(2)^k$, $\mathbf{b}$ can be represented by a linear combination of $\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_k$. Let $\mathbf{b} = \sum_{i=1}^k x_i \mathbf{b}_i$ for some $x_1, \ldots, x_k \in \{0,1\}$. (We abuse the notion a little bit, using $\sum$ for both ordinary addition and addition in GF(2). This should be always clear from the context.) Let $I_{\mathbf{b}} = \{i : x_i = 1\}$ be the set that $\mathbf{b}_i$ contributes to $\mathbf{b}$. The approximation error of the column $\mathbf{a}_j$ can be written as $\min_{\mathbf{b}} |\mathbf{a}_j - \sum_{i \in I_{\mathbf{b}}} \mathbf{a}_{(\mathbf{Ub}_i)}|$. Recall that $\mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{c}}$ is the set of indices of the columns of $\mathbf{V}$ which are equal to $\mathbf{c}$. The partition $[n] = \cup_{\mathbf{c} \in \{0,1\}^k} \mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{c}}$ suggests a way to decompose the total approximation error. First, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{c}}} \left| \mathbf{a}_j - \sum_{i \in I_{\mathbf{c}}} \mathbf{a}_{(\mathbf{Ub}_i)} \right| &\leq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{c}}} \left(\left| \mathbf{a}_j - \sum_{i \in I_{\mathbf{c}}} \mathbf{Ub}_i \right| + \sum_{i \in I_{\mathbf{c}}} |\mathbf{a}_{(\mathbf{Ub}_i)} - \mathbf{Ub}_i| \right) \\
&\leq L_{\mathbf{c}} + n_{\mathbf{c}} \sum_{i \in I_{\mathbf{c}}} M_{\mathbf{b}_i}, \qquad (10)
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is by the definition of $L_{\mathbf{c}}$, $n_{\mathbf{c}}$ and Lemma 6. Recall that $L_{\mathbf{c}}$ is the sum of the approximation error for the optimal solution $(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})$ of the columns in $\mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{c}}$. Eq.(10) leads to the following additive error bound.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Err}^{(0)}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_k) &= \sum_{j=1}^{n} \min_{\mathbf{b}\in\{0,1\}^k} \left| \mathbf{a}_j - \sum_{i\in I_{\mathbf{b}}} \mathbf{a}_{(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{b}_i)} \right| \\
&= \sum_{\mathbf{c}\in\{0,1\}^k} \sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{c}}} \min_{\mathbf{b}\in\{0,1\}^k} \left| \mathbf{a}_j - \sum_{i\in I_{\mathbf{b}}} \mathbf{a}_{(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{b}_i)} \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{\mathbf{c}\in\{0,1\}^k} \sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{c}}} \left| \mathbf{a}_j - \sum_{i\in I_{\mathbf{c}}} \mathbf{a}_{(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{b}_i)} \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{\mathbf{c}\in\{0,1\}^k} \left(L_{\mathbf{c}} + n_{\mathbf{c}} \sum_{i\in I_{\mathbf{c}}} M_{\mathbf{b}_i} \right) \\
&= \mathrm{OPT}_k + \sum_{\mathbf{c}\in\{0,1\}^k} \sum_{i\in I_{\mathbf{c}}} n_{\mathbf{c}} M_{\mathbf{b}_i}, \qquad (11)
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality uses $\mathrm{OPT}_k = \sum_{\mathbf{c}} L_{\mathbf{c}}$. Consider the second term in Eq.(11), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\mathbf{c}\in\{0,1\}^k} \sum_{i\in I_{\mathbf{c}}} n_{\mathbf{c}} M_{\mathbf{b}_i} &= \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{\mathbf{c}\in\{0,1\}^k} n_{\mathbf{c}} M_{\mathbf{b}_i} I[i \in I_{\mathbf{c}}] \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{k} M_{\mathbf{b}_i} \left(\sum_{\mathbf{c}\in\mathbf{b}_i + \mathrm{span}^{\setminus i}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r})} n_{\mathbf{c}} \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{k} M_{\mathbf{b}_i} N_{\mathbf{b}_i + \mathrm{span}^{\setminus i}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r})}, \qquad (12)
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality results from the definition of $N_{\mathcal{X}}$ in Definition 3. Combining Eq.(11) and Eq.(12) finishes the proof for $r = 0$.

Inductive Step

Assuming Eq.(7) is true for all $r' \leq r$, we are now going to show

$$\mathrm{Err}^{(r+1)}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}) \leq \mathrm{OPT}_k + \lambda_{r+1} \sum_{\mathbf{c}\in\mathrm{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})} L_{\mathbf{c}} + \sum_{i=1}^{k-r-1} f_i(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}) M_{\mathbf{b}_i}. \qquad (13)$$

As $\mathrm{Err}^{(r+1)}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}) = \min_{\mathbf{b}} \mathrm{Err}^{(r)}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}, \mathbf{b})$, we have for every set of weights $w_{\mathbf{b}}$ such that $w_{\mathbf{b}} \geq 0$ and $\sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\{0,1\}^k} w_{\mathbf{b}} = 1$,

$$\mathrm{Err}^{(r+1)}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}) \leq \sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\{0,1\}^k} w_{\mathbf{b}} \mathrm{Err}^{(r)}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}, \mathbf{b}). \qquad (14)$$

We will conduct the weighted averaging in two layers. Consider the quotient space $\mathrm{GF}(2)^k/\mathrm{span}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})$ and the induced cosets. Denote all the 2^{r+1} cosets by $\mathbf{p}_0 + \mathrm{span}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}), \cdots, \mathbf{p}_{2^{r+1}-1} + \mathrm{span}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})$. Without loss of generality, assume $\mathbf{p}_0 \in \mathrm{span}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})$. The first layer of weighted averaging will be

performed within each coset $\mathbf{p}_i + \text{span}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})$, and we will obtain an upper bound of $\text{Err}^{(r+1)}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})$ depending on $\mathbf{p}_i$. The second layer of averaging is over all the cosets, yielding the desired bound. The two layers use different rules for choosing the weights.

First Layer Weighted Averaging (within a coset):

For $\mathbf{p} \in \{\mathbf{p}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{p}_{2^{r+1}-1}\}$, define $Z(\mathbf{p}) := N_{\mathbf{p}+\text{span}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})}$. So $Z(\mathbf{p})$ is the number of columns of $\mathbf{V}$ that belong to the coset indexed by $\mathbf{p}$. We will only consider those $\mathbf{p}$ such that $Z(\mathbf{p}) > 0$. Define the weights as $w_{\mathbf{b}} = n_{\mathbf{b}}/Z(\mathbf{p})$ if $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{p}+\text{span}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})$ and zero otherwise. For every $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{p}+\text{span}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})$ one has $\text{span}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}, \mathbf{b}) = \text{span}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}, \mathbf{p})$. Combining with the inductive hypothesis we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Err}^{(r+1)}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}) \\
\leq\ & \frac{1}{Z(\mathbf{p})} \sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\mathbf{p}+\text{span}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})} n_{\mathbf{b}} \text{Err}^{(r)}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}, \mathbf{b}) \\
\leq\ & \text{OPT}_k + \lambda_r \sum_{\mathbf{c}\in\text{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1},\mathbf{p})} L_{\mathbf{c}} + \\
& \frac{1}{Z(\mathbf{p})} \sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\mathbf{p}+\text{span}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})} n_{\mathbf{b}} [f_{k-r}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}, \mathbf{b}) M_{\mathbf{b}} + \\
& \sum_{i=1}^{k-r-1} f_i(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}, \mathbf{b}) M_{\mathbf{b}_i}]
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Our next goal is to bound the two terms in the last row of Eq.(15) separately.

Bounding the first term in the last row of Eq.(15)

For the first term, we will show that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{Z(\mathbf{p})} \sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\mathbf{p}+\text{span}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})} n_{\mathbf{b}} f_{k-r}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}, \mathbf{b}) M_{\mathbf{b}} \\
=\ & \sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\mathbf{p}+\text{span}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})} L_{\mathbf{b}} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{1}{2Z(\mathbf{p})} N_{\text{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1},\mathbf{p})}\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

By the definition of $M_{\mathbf{b}}$, it is easy to see $n_{\mathbf{b}} M_{\mathbf{b}} = L_{\mathbf{b}}$. So we focus on analyzing $f_{k-r}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}, \mathbf{b})$. In fact, for every $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{p} + \text{span}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})$, we have

$$\text{span}^{\setminus(k-r)}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}, \mathbf{b}) = \text{span}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})$$

Therefore

$$\mathbf{b}+\text{span}^{\setminus(k-r)}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}, \mathbf{b}) = \mathbf{b}+\text{span}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}) = \mathbf{p}+\text{span}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})$$

Also,

$$\text{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}, \mathbf{b}) = \text{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}, \mathbf{p})$$

Thus, for all $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{p} + \text{span}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_{k-r}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}, \mathbf{b}) &= N_{\mathbf{b}+\text{span}^{\setminus(k-r)}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1},\mathbf{b})} + \frac{1}{2} N_{\text{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1},\mathbf{b})} \\ &= N_{\mathbf{p}+\text{span}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})} + \frac{1}{2} N_{\text{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1},\mathbf{p})} \end{aligned}$$

Combining above, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{Z(\mathbf{p})} \sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\mathbf{p}+\text{span}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})} n_{\mathbf{b}} f_{k-r}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}, \mathbf{b}) M_{\mathbf{b}} \\ = & \sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\mathbf{p}+\text{span}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})} L_{\mathbf{b}} \cdot \frac{1}{Z(\mathbf{p})} \cdot \left(N_{\mathbf{p}+\text{span}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})} + \frac{1}{2} N_{\text{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1},\mathbf{p})} \right) \\ = & \sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\mathbf{p}+\text{span}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})} L_{\mathbf{b}} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{1}{2Z(\mathbf{p})} N_{\text{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1},\mathbf{p})} \right) \end{aligned}$$

This complete the proof of Eq.(16).

Bounding the second term in the last row of Eq.(15)

For the second term, we are going to show

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{Z(\mathbf{p})} \sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\mathbf{p}+\text{span}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})} n_{\mathbf{b}} \sum_{i=1}^{k-r-1} f_i(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}, \mathbf{b}) M_{\mathbf{b}_i} \\ = & \frac{1}{Z(\mathbf{p})} \sum_{i=1}^{k-r-1} M_{\mathbf{b}_i} \sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\mathbf{p}+\text{span}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})} n_\beta f_i(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}, \mathbf{b}) \\ \leq & \sum_{i=1}^{k-r-1} M_{\mathbf{b}_i} f_i(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}) \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

Consider $f_i(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}, \mathbf{b})$. Observe that for all $1 \leq i \leq k-r-1$ and $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{p} + \text{span}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_i(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}, \mathbf{b}) &= N_{\mathbf{b}_i+\text{span}^{\setminus i}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1},\mathbf{b})} + \frac{1}{2} N_{\text{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1},\mathbf{b})} \\ &= N_{\mathbf{b}_i+\text{span}^{\setminus i}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1},\mathbf{b})} + \frac{1}{2} N_{\text{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1},\mathbf{p})}. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{b}_i + \text{span}^{\setminus i}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}, \mathbf{b}) &= [\mathbf{b}_i + \text{span}^{\setminus i}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})] \cup \\ & \quad [\mathbf{b}_i + \mathbf{b} + \text{span}^{\setminus i}(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})] \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_i(\mathbf{b}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}, \mathbf{b}) &= N_{\mathbf{b}_i+\mathbf{b}+\text{span}^{\setminus i}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})} + N_{\mathbf{b}_i+\text{span}^{\setminus i}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})} + \\ & \quad \frac{1}{2} N_{\text{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1},\mathbf{p})}. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} X_1(i,\mathbf{p}) &= \mathbf{p}+\text{span}^{\setminus i}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}) \\ X_2(i,\mathbf{p}) &= \mathbf{p}+\mathbf{b}_i+\text{span}^{\setminus i}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}) \\ X_3(i,\mathbf{p}) &= \mathbf{b}_i+\text{span}^{\setminus i}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}) \\ X_4(i,\mathbf{p}) &= \text{span}^{c}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1},\mathbf{p}) \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

It is clear that $\forall j_1,j_2\in\{1,2,3,4\}, j_1\neq j_2$, one has $X_{j_1}(i,\mathbf{p})\cap X_{j_2}(i,\mathbf{p})=\varnothing$, and $X_1(i,\mathbf{p})\cup X_2(i,\mathbf{p})=\mathbf{p}+\text{span}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})$.
If $\mathbf{b}\in X_1(i,\mathbf{p})$, then $\mathbf{b}_i+\mathbf{b}+\text{span}^{\setminus i}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})=\mathbf{b}_i+\mathbf{p}+\text{span}^{\setminus i}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})$. Combining Eq.(19) and Eq.(20) yields

$$f_i(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1},\mathbf{b})=N_{X_2(i,\mathbf{p})}+N_{X_3(i,\mathbf{p})}+\frac{1}{2}N_{X_4(i,\mathbf{p})} \tag{21}$$

If $\mathbf{b}\in X_2(i,\mathbf{p})$, then $\mathbf{b}_i+\mathbf{b}+\text{span}^{\setminus i}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})=\mathbf{p}+\text{span}^{\setminus i}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})$. Combining Eq.(19) and Eq.(20) yields

$$f_i(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1},\mathbf{b})=N_{X_1(i,\mathbf{p})}+N_{X_3(i,\mathbf{p})}+\frac{1}{2}N_{X_4(i,\mathbf{p})} \tag{22}$$

Now we bound the inner summation in the second line of Eq.(17).

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\mathbf{p}+\text{span}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})} n_{\mathbf{b}} f_i(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1},\mathbf{b}) \\ =&\sum_{\mathbf{b}\in X_1(i,\mathbf{p})\cup X_2(i,\mathbf{p})} n_{\mathbf{b}} f_i(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1},\mathbf{b}) \\ =&\sum_{\mathbf{b}\in X_1(i,\mathbf{p})} n_{\mathbf{b}} f_i(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1},\mathbf{b})+\sum_{\mathbf{b}\in X_2(i,\mathbf{p})} n_{\mathbf{b}} f_i(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1},\mathbf{b}) \\ =&\sum_{\mathbf{b}\in X_1(i,\mathbf{p})} n_{\mathbf{b}}\left(N_{X_2(i,\mathbf{p})}+N_{X_3(i,\mathbf{p})}+\frac{1}{2}N_{X_4(i,\mathbf{p})}\right) \\ &+\sum_{\mathbf{b}\in X_2(i,\mathbf{p})} n_{\mathbf{b}}\left(N_{X_1(i,\mathbf{p})}+N_{X_3(i,\mathbf{p})}+\frac{1}{2}N_{X_4(i,\mathbf{p})}\right) \\ =&N_{X_1(i,\mathbf{p})}\left(N_{X_2(i,\mathbf{p})}+N_{X_3(i,\mathbf{p})}+\frac{1}{2}N_{X_4(i,\mathbf{p})}\right) \\ &+N_{X_2(i,\mathbf{p})}\left(N_{X_1(i,\mathbf{p})}+N_{X_3(i,\mathbf{p})}+\frac{1}{2}N_{X_4(i,\mathbf{p})}\right) \\ =&2N_{X_1(i,\mathbf{p})}N_{X_2(i,\mathbf{p})}+(N_{X_1(i,\mathbf{p})}+N_{X_2(i,\mathbf{p})})\left(N_{X_3(i,\mathbf{p})}+\frac{1}{2}N_{X_4(i,\mathbf{p})}\right) \\ \leq&\frac{1}{2}(N_{X_1(i,\mathbf{p})}+N_{X_2(i,\mathbf{p})})^2+(N_{X_1(i,\mathbf{p})}+N_{X_2(i,\mathbf{p})})\left(N_{X_3(i,\mathbf{p})}+\frac{1}{2}N_{X_4(i,\mathbf{p})}\right) \\ =&(N_{X_1(i,\mathbf{p})}+N_{X_2(i,\mathbf{p})})\left[\frac{1}{2}(N_{X_1(i,\mathbf{p})}+N_{X_2(i,\mathbf{p})}+N_{X_4(i,\mathbf{p})})+N_{X_3(i,\mathbf{p})}\right], \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

where the third equation follows from Eq.(21) and Eq.(22). By Eq.(20) and Eq.(21), we have

$$Z(\mathbf{p})=N_{\mathbf{p}+\text{span}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})}=N_{X_1(i,\mathbf{p})}+N_{X_2(i,\mathbf{p})}, \tag{24}$$

and

$$X_1(i,\mathbf{p})\cup X_2(i,\mathbf{p})\cup X_4(i,\mathbf{p})=\text{span}^{c}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}). \tag{25}$$

Thus

$$N_{X_1(i,\mathbf{p})} + N_{X_2(i,\mathbf{p})} + N_{X_4(i,\mathbf{p})} = N_{\mathrm{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})}. \tag{26}$$

Therefore, by Eq.(20), Eq.(24), Eq.(26) and the definition of $f_i(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&(N_{X_1(i,\mathbf{p})} + N_{X_2(i,\mathbf{p})}) \left[\frac{1}{2}(N_{X_1(i,\mathbf{p})} + N_{X_2(i,\mathbf{p})} + N_{X_4(i,\mathbf{p})}) + N_{X_3(i,\mathbf{p})}\right] \\
= \;& Z(\mathbf{p}) \left(\frac{1}{2} N_{\mathrm{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})} + N_{\mathbf{b}_i+\mathrm{span}^{\setminus i}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})}\right) \\
= \;& Z(\mathbf{p}) f_i(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}).
\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

Substitute Eq.(27) into Eq.(23), we get

$$\sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\mathbf{p}+\mathrm{span}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})} n_{\mathbf{b}} f_i(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1},\mathbf{b}) \le Z(\mathbf{p}) f_i(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}).$$

Now we are able to prove Eq.(17),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{Z(\mathbf{p})} \sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\mathbf{p}+\mathrm{span}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})} n_{\mathbf{b}} \sum_{i=1}^{k-r-1} f_i(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1},\mathbf{b}) M_{\mathbf{b}_i} \\
= \;& \frac{1}{Z(\mathbf{p})} \sum_{i=1}^{k-r-1} M_{\mathbf{b}_i} \sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\mathbf{p}+\mathrm{span}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})} n_{\mathbf{b}} f_i(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1},\mathbf{b}) \\
\le \;& \frac{1}{Z(\mathbf{p})} \sum_{i=1}^{k-r-1} M_{\mathbf{b}_i} Z(\mathbf{p}) f_i(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}) \\
= \;& \sum_{i=1}^{k-r-1} M_{\mathbf{b}_i} f_i(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}).
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

This finishes bounding the second term in Eq.(15).

Finally, combine Eq.(15), Eq.(16) and Eq.(17), we have for all $\mathbf{p} \in \{\mathbf{p}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{p}_{2^{r+1}-1}\}$ such that $Z(\mathbf{p}) > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{Err}^{(r+1)}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}) \\
\le \;& \mathrm{OPT}_k + \lambda_r \sum_{\mathbf{c}\in\mathrm{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1},\mathbf{p})} L_{\mathbf{c}} + \sum_{i=1}^{k-r-1} f_i(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}) M_{\mathbf{b}_i} \\
&+ \left(1 + \frac{1}{2Z(p)} N_{\mathrm{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1},\mathbf{p})}\right) \sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\mathbf{p}+\mathrm{span}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})} L_{\mathbf{b}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

Note that $\mathrm{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}) = \mathrm{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1},\mathbf{p}) \cup [\mathbf{p}+\mathrm{span}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})]$, we have

$$\sum_{\mathbf{c}\in\mathrm{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1},\mathbf{p})} L_{\mathbf{c}} = \sum_{\mathbf{c}\in\mathrm{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})} L_{\mathbf{c}} - \sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\mathbf{p}+\mathrm{span}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})} L_{\mathbf{b}}. \tag{30}$$

Substitute Eq.(30) into Eq.(29), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{Err}^{(r+1)}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}) \\
\leq\ & \mathrm{OPT}_k + \lambda_r \sum_{\mathbf{c}\in \mathrm{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})} L_{\mathbf{c}} + \sum_{i=1}^{k-r-1} f_i(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}) M_{\mathbf{b}_i} \\
&+ \left(1 + \frac{1}{2Z(\mathbf{p})} N_{\mathrm{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1},\mathbf{p})} - \lambda_r\right) \sum_{\mathbf{b}\in p+\mathrm{span}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})} L_{\mathbf{b}}. \qquad (31)
\end{aligned}$$

Now we finish the first layer weighted averaging. Eq.(31) is the bound obtained by averaging within the coset indexed by $\mathbf{p}$. This bound will be further used in the second layer.

Before we move to the second layer averaging, we point out that the inductive step $r \to r+1$ for the special case $r = 0$ has already been proved; and we do not need to involve the second layer. To see this, note that when $r = 0$, $\mathrm{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1},\mathbf{p}) = \emptyset$ and $\mathbf{p} + \mathrm{span}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}) = \mathrm{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})$. Substitute these two equalities into Eq.(29) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Err}^{(1)}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-1}) &= \mathrm{OPT}_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} f_i(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-1}) M_{\mathbf{b}_i} + \sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\mathrm{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-1})} L_{\mathbf{b}} \\
&= \mathrm{OPT}_k + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} f_i(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-1}) M_{\mathbf{b}_i} + \lambda_1 \sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\mathrm{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-1})} L_{\mathbf{b}},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last step uses $\lambda_{r+1} = \lambda_1 = 1$.

Now we will move to the second layer averaging, and we will assume $r \geq 1$ since $r = 0$ has already been proved.

Second Layer Weighted Averaging (over the cosets)

In this layer we will conduct weighted averaging over all the nontrivial cosets. A coset $\mathbf{p}_i + \mathrm{span}(\mathbf{b}_1,\ldots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})$ is nontrivial if $Z(\mathbf{p}_i) > 0$ and $i \neq 0$ (i.e., the coset is not equal to $\mathrm{span}(\mathbf{b}_1,\ldots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})$). In Eq.(31) we already obtain an upper bound for Err^{r+1} by weighted averaging within each nontrivial coset. In this layer we will prove the theorem by averaging over all the nontrivial cosets based on Eq.(31). Note that in the upper bound Eq.(31), only the last term depends on the coset. So we will focus on this term. For notational simplicity, denote this last term as H:

$$H := \left(1 + \frac{1}{2Z(\mathbf{p})} N_{\mathrm{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1},\mathbf{p})} - \lambda_r\right) \sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\mathbf{p}+\mathrm{span}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})} L_{\mathbf{b}}. \qquad (32)$$

Note that

$$[\mathbf{p}_i + \mathrm{span}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})] \cup \mathrm{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1},\mathbf{p}_i) = \mathrm{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}),$$

and

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^{2^{r+1}-1} \mathbf{p}_i + \mathrm{span}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}) = \mathrm{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}).$$

We have

$$N_{\mathrm{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1},\mathbf{p}_i)} = N_{\mathrm{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})} - N_{\mathbf{p}_i+\mathrm{span}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})} = \sum_{j=1}^{2^{r+1}-1} Z(\mathbf{p}_j) - Z(\mathbf{p}_i).$$

Thus for a nontrivial coset indexed by $\mathbf{p}_i$ we have

$$1+\frac{1}{2Z(\mathbf{p}_i)}N_{\mathrm{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1},\mathbf{p}_i)}-\lambda_r=\frac{1}{2Z(\mathbf{p}_i)}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{2^{r+1}-1}Z(\mathbf{p}_j)-(2\lambda_r-1)Z(\mathbf{p}_i)\right] \quad (33)$$

By Eq.(32) and Eq.(33), we have that for all $i\in[2^{r+1}-1]$ such that $Z(\mathbf{p}_i)>0$,

$$H=\frac{1}{2Z(\mathbf{p}_i)}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{2^{r+1}-1}Z(\mathbf{p}_j)-(2\lambda_r-1)Z(\mathbf{p}_i)\right]\sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\mathbf{p}_i+\mathrm{span}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})}L_{\mathbf{b}} \quad (34)$$

Before we start the weighted averaging, we need to treat a special case differently. Consider the case that there exists a nontrivial coset indexed by $\mathbf{p}_i$ such that $\sum_{j=1}^{2^{r+1}-1}Z(\mathbf{p}_j)-(2\lambda_r-1)Z(\mathbf{p}_i)\leq 0$. In this case, $H\leq 0$ as a result of Eq.(34). Combining Eq.(31) and the fact that $\lambda_r\leq\lambda_{r+1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{Err}^{(r+1)}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})\\
\leq\ &\mathrm{OPT}_k+\lambda_r\sum_{\mathbf{c}\in\mathrm{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})}L_{\mathbf{c}}+\sum_{i=1}^{k-r-1}f_i(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})M_{\mathbf{b}_i}\\
\leq\ &\mathrm{OPT}_k+\lambda_{r+1}\sum_{\mathbf{c}\in\mathrm{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})}L_{\mathbf{c}}+\sum_{i=1}^{k-r-1}f_i(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})M_{\mathbf{b}_i}
\end{aligned}$$

So the theorem is true for this special case.

Below we conduct the weighted averaging assuming all the nontrivial cosets satisfy

$$\sum_{j=1}^{2^{r+1}-1}Z(\mathbf{p}_j)-(2\lambda_r-1)Z(\mathbf{p}_i)>0.$$

The weights are set as follows. We only give positive weights to nontrivial cosets. We assign to a nontrivial coset indexed by $\mathbf{p}_i$ weight w_i given by:

$$w_i=\frac{2Z(\mathbf{p}_i)}{\sum_{j=1}^{2^{r+1}-1}Z(\mathbf{p}_j)-(2\lambda_r-1)Z(\mathbf{p}_i)}.$$

By Eq.(34) we thus have

$$w_iH=\sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\mathbf{p}_i+\mathrm{span}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})}L_{\mathbf{b}}.$$

Hence

$$\sum_{i=1}^{2^{r+1}-1}w_iH=\sum_{i=1}^{2^{r+1}-1}\sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\mathbf{p}_i+\mathrm{span}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})}L_{\mathbf{b}}=\sum_{\mathbf{b}\in\mathrm{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})}L_{\mathbf{b}}. \quad (35)$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 5 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^{2^{r+1}-1}w_i&=2\sum_{i=1}^{2^{r+1}-1}\frac{Z(\mathbf{p}_i)}{\sum_{j=1}^{2^{r+1}-1}Z(\mathbf{p}_j)-(2\lambda_r-1)Z(\mathbf{p}_i)}\\
&\geq\frac{2(2^{r+1}-1)}{2^{r+1}-1-(2\lambda_r-1)}\\
&=\frac{2^{r+1}-1}{2^r-\lambda_r} \quad (36)
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that $(2^r-1)\lambda_r = r2^{r-1}$, we thus have

$$(2^{r+1}-1)\lambda_{r+1} - 2(2^r-1)\lambda_r = (r+1)2^r - r2^r = 2^r,$$

and therefore,

$$(2^{r+1}-1)\lambda_{r+1} - (2^{r+1}-1)\lambda_r = 2^r - \lambda_r. \tag{37}$$

Combining Eq.(37) and Eq.(36) we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^{2^{r+1}-1} w_i \geq \frac{1}{\lambda_{r+1}-\lambda_r}. \tag{38}$$

By Eq.(35) and Eq.(38) we have

$$H \leq (\lambda_{r+1}-\lambda_r) \sum_{\mathbf{b}\in \mathrm{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})} L_{\mathbf{b}}. \tag{39}$$

Combining Eq.(39) with Eq.(31) and the definition of H in Eq.(32) we finally obtain,

$$\mathrm{Err}^{(r+1)}(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}) \leq \mathrm{OPT}_k + \lambda_{r+1} \sum_{\mathbf{c}\in \mathrm{span}^c(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1})} L_{\mathbf{c}} + \sum_{i=1}^{k-r-1} f_i(\mathbf{b}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{b}_{k-r-1}) M_{\mathbf{b}_i}.$$

This finishes the inductive step and completes the proof of the theorem.

□

Proof of Theorem 2

The proof is constructive. For every k and $\epsilon > 0$, we will explicitly give a matrix $\mathbf{A}$, when taken as input, the column-selection algorithm has error lower bounded by $\left(\frac{k}{2}+1+\frac{k}{2(2^k-1)}-\epsilon\right)\cdot \mathrm{OPT}_k$. For simplicity, we will construct a square matrix, i.e., $d = n$. Based on this construction, rectangular matrices such that $d|n$ work as well. We denote the matrix to be constructed as $\mathbf{A}$. The idea is to let this matrix be an approximate low rank matrix. That is, $\mathbf{A}$ is the product of two rank-k matrices plus a sparse (noise) matrix.

We assume the size of $\mathbf{A}$ satisfies $k|n$ and $(2^k-1)|n$. Let $p := n/k$ and $q := n/(2^k-1)$. $\mathbf{A}$ is constructed as follows.

$$\mathbf{A} := \mathbf{L}\mathbf{R} + \mathbf{I}_n, \tag{40}$$

where $\mathbf{I}_n$ is the identity matrix, $\mathbf{L}$ is an $n \times k$ matrix defined as:

$$\mathbf{L} := \left(\begin{array}{cccc} \mathbf{c}_1 & \mathbf{c}_2 & \ldots & \mathbf{c}_k \end{array}\right),$$

where $\mathbf{c}_i = \left(\underbrace{0\ldots01\ldots10\ldots0}_{(i-1)p \quad p \quad (k-i)p}\right)^T$. For each $\mathbf{c}_i$ all but p elements are zero. $\mathbf{R}$ is a $k \times n$ matrix defined as:

$$\mathbf{R} := \left(\begin{array}{cccc} \mathbf{b}_1\otimes\mathbf{1}_q & \mathbf{b}_2\otimes\mathbf{1}_q & \ldots & \mathbf{b}_{2^k-1}\otimes\mathbf{1}_q \end{array}\right),$$

where $\mathbf{1}_q = (11\ldots1)^T$ is the all-one vector of size q; $\otimes$ is the Kronecker product; and $\mathbf{b}_i$, which is a k-dimensional column vector, is the binary representation of i, e.g., $\mathbf{b}_1 =$

$(0\ldots001)^T$, $\mathbf{b}_2 = (0\ldots010)^T$, $\mathbf{b}_3 = (0\ldots011)^T$, etc. Below is a visualization of A

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \ldots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 1 & 0 & \ldots & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \ldots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 0 & 1 & \ldots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \ldots & 1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \ldots & 1 \end{pmatrix}_{n\times k} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & 0 & 0 & & 0 & & 1 & & 1 \\ \vdots & \ldots & \vdots & \vdots & \ldots & \vdots & \ldots & \vdots & \ldots & \vdots \\ 0 & & 0 & 1 & & 1 & & 1 & & 1 \\ 1 & & 1 & 0 & & 0 & & 1 & & 1 \end{pmatrix}_{k\times n} + \mathbf{I}_n$$

The properties of $\mathbf{L}$ and $\mathbf{R}$ we will use are 1) The 1s in different columns of $\mathbf{L}$ do not overlap. Any non-zero linear combination of the columns of $\mathbf{L}$ contains at least q 1s; 2) The columns of $\mathbf{R}$ contain all non-zero k-dimensional vectors (and repeat q times).

To prove the theorem we will show that no matter which k columns of $\mathbf{A}$ are chosen to form the basis matrix, the induced approximation error is at least the desired lower bound for sufficiently large n.

We will discuss two cases separately. In the first case we assume that the k columns chosen from $\mathbf{A}$ has such a property: These k columns $\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{I}_n$ are linear independent. In the second case we assume they are linear dependent.

Now consider the first case. Let $(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})$ be the output of the column-selection algorithm for input matrix $\mathbf{A}$. $\mathbf{U}$ consists of k columns of $\mathbf{A}$. Let the indices of these k columns be $i_1, \ldots, i_k$. Let $\mathbf{U}^-$ be the matrix consisting of the columns $i_1, \ldots, i_k$ of $\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{I}_n$. Let us consider the rank-k approximation of $\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{I}_n$. $\mathbf{U}^-$ must be an optimal basis matrix because $\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{I}_n = \mathbf{LR}$ is of rank k and by our assumption $\mathbf{U}^-$ consists of k linear independent columns, each is a linear combination of the columns of $\mathbf{L}$. So there is a k by n matrix $\mathbf{V}^-$ such that $\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{I}_n = \mathbf{U}^-\mathbf{V}^-$.

Our local goal is to show $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{V}^-$ if n is sufficiently large. Consider the column-wise approximation error of $\mathbf{A}$ by $\mathbf{UV}$. Let $\mathbf{A} = (\mathbf{a}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{a}_n)$, $\mathbf{V} = (\mathbf{v}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{v}_n)$, and $\mathbf{V}^- = (\mathbf{v}_1^-, \ldots, \mathbf{v}_n^-)$. For brevity, we will use $|\cdot|$ to represent $\|\|_F$. For column i, on the one hand we have,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{U}\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{a}_i| &= |\mathbf{U}\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{U}\mathbf{v}_i^- + \mathbf{U}\mathbf{v}_i^- - \mathbf{U}^-\mathbf{v}_i^- + \mathbf{U}^-\mathbf{v}_i^- - \mathbf{a}_i| \\ &\geqslant |\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{v}_i^-)| - |(\mathbf{U} - \mathbf{U}^-)\mathbf{v}_i^-| - |\mathbf{U}^-\mathbf{v}_i^- - \mathbf{a}_i|. \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{U}\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{a}_i| &= |\mathbf{U}\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{U}\mathbf{v}_i^- + \mathbf{U}\mathbf{v}_i^- - \mathbf{U}^-\mathbf{v}_i^- + \mathbf{U}^-\mathbf{v}_i^- - \mathbf{a}_i| \\ &\leq |\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{v}_i^-)| + |(\mathbf{U} - \mathbf{U}^-)\mathbf{v}_i^-| + |\mathbf{U}^-\mathbf{v}_i^- - \mathbf{a}_i|. \end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

Let us analyze the three terms in the RHS of Eq.(41) and Eq.(42) respectively. If $\mathbf{V} \neq \mathbf{V}^-$, there must be a column i such that $\mathbf{v}_i \neq \mathbf{v}_i^-$. So the first term $\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{v}_i^-)$ is a non-zero linear combination of the columns of $\mathbf{U}$. As $\mathbf{U}$ consists of k columns of $\mathbf{LR} + \mathbf{I}_n$, by the construction of $\mathbf{L}$ and $\mathbf{R}$, it is not difficult to see that when $\mathbf{v}_i \neq \mathbf{v}_i^-$, $|\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{v}_i^-)| \geq p - 1$. For the second term $|(\mathbf{U} - \mathbf{U}^-)\mathbf{v}_i^-|$, since each column of $\mathbf{U} - \mathbf{U}^-$ is of form $\mathbf{e}_j = (0\ldots010\ldots0)^T$(only the j-th element is 1) for some j, we have

$|(\mathbf{U}-\mathbf{U}^-)\mathbf{v}_i^-| = |\mathbf{v}_i^-| \le k$. For the third term $\mathbf{U}^-\mathbf{v}_i^- - \mathbf{a}_i$, because $\mathbf{U}^-\mathbf{V}^- = \mathbf{LR}$, we have $|\mathbf{U}^-\mathbf{v}_i^- - \mathbf{a}_i| = |\mathbf{e}_i| = 1$.

Combining the above argument, if $\mathbf{v}_i \neq \mathbf{v}_i^-$, then $|\mathbf{U}\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{a}_i| \ge p-k-2$. If $\mathbf{v}_i = \mathbf{v}_i^-$, then $|\mathbf{U}\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{a}_i| \le k+1$. Thus for n sufficiently large so that $p = n/k$ is lager than $2k+3$, we must have $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{V}^-$.

Now we are able to calculate the column-wise approximation error. For i such that $\mathbf{a}_i$ is a column of $\mathbf{U}$, the approximation error of this column is zero. For i such that $\mathbf{a}_i$ is not a column of $\mathbf{U}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{U}\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{a}_i| &= |\mathbf{U}\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{U}\mathbf{v}_i^- + \mathbf{U}\mathbf{v}_i^- - \mathbf{U}^-\mathbf{v}_i^- + \mathbf{U}^-\mathbf{v}_i^- - \mathbf{a}_i| \\ &= |(\mathbf{U}-\mathbf{U}^-)\mathbf{v}_i^- + \mathbf{U}^-\mathbf{v}_i^- - \mathbf{a}_i| \\ &= |(\mathbf{U}-\mathbf{U}^-)\mathbf{v}_i^- + \mathbf{e}_i|. \end{aligned}$$

As argued above, each column of $\mathbf{U}-\mathbf{U}^-$ is of form $\mathbf{e}_j$ for some j. Note that i must be different to j since $\mathbf{a}_i$ is not a column of $\mathbf{U}$. Thus we have $|(\mathbf{U}-\mathbf{U}^-)\mathbf{v}_i^- + \mathbf{e}_i| = |\mathbf{v}_i^-| + 1$. Therefore,

$$|\mathbf{UV}-\mathbf{A}| = \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\mathbf{U}\mathbf{v}_i - \mathbf{a}_i| = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (1 + |\mathbf{v}_i^-|) - 2k = n - 2k + \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\mathbf{v}_i^-|, \tag{43}$$

where the second equation holds because for a column i so that $\mathbf{a}_i$ is in $\mathbf{U}$, we have $|\mathbf{v}_i^-| = |\mathbf{v}_i| = 1$; and the total number of i such that $\mathbf{a}_i$ belongs to $\mathbf{U}$ is k.

Now let us examine $\mathbf{v}_i^-$. Because $\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{I}_n = \mathbf{LR}$ contains all $2^k - 1$ non-zero linear combinations of the column vectors of $\mathbf{L}$; and recall that $\mathbf{U}^-$ consists of k linear independent vectors, each is a linear combination of the vectors of $\mathbf{L}$, $\mathbf{V}^-$ must be a column-shuffled version of $\mathbf{R}$, i.e., the ordering of the columns changed. From this fact and the construction of $\mathbf{R}$ it is not difficult to see that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} |\mathbf{v}_i^-| = qk2^{k-1}. \tag{44}$$

So the approximation error for the column-selection algorithm is $|\mathbf{A}-\mathbf{UV}| = n + qk2^{k-1} - 2k$. Let us compare this approximation error to that of the optimal approximation. Note that $(\mathbf{L}, \mathbf{R})$ yields an approximation error n. So the optimal error is at most n. Thus we have the approximation ratio of the column-selection algorithm is at least $\frac{n+qk2^{k-1}-2k}{n} = 1 + \frac{k}{2} + \frac{k}{2(2^k-1)} - \frac{2k}{n}$. By letting n larger than $2k/\epsilon$ we prove the lower bound.

Finally consider the second case that the k columns chosen from $\mathbf{A}$ has the property that the corresponding k columns of $\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{I}_n$ are linear dependent. It is not difficult to check, from the construction of $\mathbf{L}$ and $\mathbf{R}$, that the columns of $\mathbf{L}$ which cannot be represented by the k columns of $\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{I}_n$ must induce a total approximation error at least $pq - n$. So the approximation ratio is no less than $\frac{pq-n}{n} = \frac{n}{k(2^k-1)} - 1$, which goes to infinity as n getting large. This complete the proof. □

3 Low Rank Approximation Over Boolean Semiring

For the Boolean model, it is more convenient to use sets instead of vectors as the representation. For a column $\mathbf{a}_i$ of $\mathbf{A}$, let $\mathcal{A}_i := \{j \in [d] : a_{ij} = 1\}$, i.e., $\mathbf{a}_i$ is the characteristic string of $\mathcal{A}_i$. Similarly, for an optimal solution $(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})$ of the Boolean low rank approximation problem, let $\mathcal{U}_i := \{j \in [d] : u_{ij} = 1\}$ and $\mathcal{V}_i := \{j \in [k] : v_{ij} = 1\}$. Thus

in this section we will always think of a column of $\mathbf{A}$, $\mathbf{U}$ or $\mathbf{V}$ as a set. Given a set $\mathcal{S} \subset [k]$, let $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{S}} := \{j \in [n] : \mathcal{V}_j = \mathcal{S}\}$, and $n_{\mathcal{S}} := |\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{S}}|$. Using these notions, the Boolean product of $\mathbf{U}$ and a vector which is the characteristic string of $\mathcal{S}$ will be denoted by $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}} := \bigcup_{i\in\mathcal{S}} \mathcal{U}_i$. (Abuse the notion a little, we still use $\mathcal{U}_i$ instead of $\mathcal{U}_{\{i\}}$ below.) Like in the previous section, the nearest neighbor column of $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}}$ in $\mathbf{A}$ is defined by $\mathbf{a}_{(\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}})}$. As we use set representation in this section, for notational simplicity we let $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{S}} \subset [d]$ be the set corresponding to this nearest neighbor column $\mathbf{a}_{(\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}})}$, i.e., $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{S}} := \{i \in [d] : \mathbf{a}_{(\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}})_i} = 1\}$.

We are going to construct a rank-k solution $\mathcal{B}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_k$, where $\mathcal{B}_i \subset [d]$ is the set representation of the column of the basis matrix. Once the basis matrix is obtained, the coefficient matrix can be calculated in the same way as in the previous section.

Let $\mathcal{S}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{S}_{2^k-1}$ be an ordering of the $2^k - 1$ non-empty subsets of $[k]$ so that $n_{\mathcal{S}_1} \leq \ldots \leq n_{\mathcal{S}_{2^k-1}}$, and $\mathcal{S}_0 = \emptyset$. As described in Introduction, we will construct $\mathcal{B}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_k$ in such a way that 1) $\mathcal{B}_i$ is a Boolean combination of $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{S}_l}$ for all $\ell \in [2^k - 1]$; and 2) for all $\ell \in [2^k - 1]$

$$\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_\ell} \triangle \left(\bigcup_{i\in S_\ell} \mathcal{B}_i \right) \subseteq \left(\bigcup_{\ell' \geq \ell} (\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}} \triangle \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}}) \right). \tag{45}$$

Lemma 7 *If Eq.(45) is true for all $\ell \in [2^k - 1]$, then the approximation ratio induced by the basis matrix whose columns are $\mathcal{B}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_k$ is at most 2^k.*

Proof First we have for all ℓ

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathcal{A}_j \triangle \left(\bigcup_{i\in\mathcal{S}_\ell} \mathcal{B}_i \right) \right| &\leq |\mathcal{A}_j \triangle \mathcal{U}_{S_\ell}| + |\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_\ell} \triangle (\bigcup_{i\in S_\ell} \mathcal{B}_i)| \\ &\leq |\mathcal{A}_j \triangle \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_\ell}| + \sum_{\ell' \geq \ell} |\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}} \triangle \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}}|. \end{aligned}$$

Take summation both sides for all $j \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{S}_\ell}$, we have

$$\sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{S}_\ell}} \left| \mathcal{A}_j \triangle \left(\bigcup_{i\in S_\ell} \mathcal{B}_i \right) \right| \leq (\sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{S}_\ell}} |\mathcal{A}_j \triangle \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_\ell}|) + \sum_{\ell' \geq \ell} n_{\mathcal{S}_\ell} |\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}} \triangle \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}}|.$$

Let $\mathrm{Err}(\mathcal{B}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_k)$ denote the approximation error induced by the basis $\mathcal{B}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_k$; and OPT_k be the error of the optimal solution. Taking summation both sides for all $\ell \in [2^k - 1]$ in the above inequality and then add $(\sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{S}_0}} |\mathcal{A}_j|)$ both sides, we have

$$\mathrm{Err}(\mathcal{B}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_k) \leq \mathrm{OPT}_k + \sum_{\ell=1}^{2^k-1} \sum_{\ell' \geq \ell} n_{\mathcal{S}_\ell} |\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}} \triangle \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}}|$$

Since $n_{\mathcal{S}_\ell} \leq n_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}}$ for all $\ell' \geq \ell$, the last inequality becomes

$$\mathrm{Err}(\mathcal{B}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_k) \leq \mathrm{OPT}_k + \sum_{\ell=1}^{2^k-1} \sum_{\ell' \geq \ell} n_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}} |\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}} \triangle \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}}|$$

Change the order of summations for ℓ and ℓ', and use the fact that $n_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}} |\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}} \triangle \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}}| \leq$

$\sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}}} |\mathcal{A}_j \triangle \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}}|$, we finally get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Err}(\mathcal{B}_1,\ldots,\mathcal{B}_k) &\le \mathrm{OPT}_k + \sum_{\ell'=1}^{2^k-1} \ell' \sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}}} |\mathcal{A}_j \triangle \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}}| \\ &\le \mathrm{OPT}_k + (2^k-1) \sum_{\ell'=1}^{2^k-1} \sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}}} |\mathcal{A}_j \triangle \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}}| \\ &\le 2^k \,\mathrm{OPT}_k\,.\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. □

Before describing the construction, we state the following results which will be frequently used in the rest of this section. Let $\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B},\mathcal{C},\mathcal{D}$ be sets.

Lemma 8 *1.* $(\mathcal{A}\cup\mathcal{B})\setminus\mathcal{C} = (\mathcal{A}\setminus\mathcal{C})\cup(\mathcal{B}\setminus\mathcal{C})$

2. $(\mathcal{A}\cap\mathcal{B})\setminus\mathcal{C} = (\mathcal{A}\setminus\mathcal{C})\cap(\mathcal{B}\setminus\mathcal{C})$

3. $\mathcal{A}\setminus(\mathcal{B}\cup\mathcal{C}) = (\mathcal{A}\setminus\mathcal{B})\cap(\mathcal{A}\setminus\mathcal{C})$

4. $\mathcal{A}\setminus(\mathcal{B}\cap\mathcal{C}) = (\mathcal{A}\setminus\mathcal{B})\cup(\mathcal{A}\setminus\mathcal{C})$

Corollary 9 *By the previous lemma:*

1. $(\mathcal{A}\cup\mathcal{B})\setminus(\mathcal{C}\cup\mathcal{D}) \subseteq (\mathcal{A}\setminus\mathcal{C})\cup(\mathcal{B}\setminus\mathcal{D})$

2. $(\mathcal{A}\cap\mathcal{B})\setminus(\mathcal{C}\cap\mathcal{D}) \subseteq (\mathcal{A}\setminus\mathcal{C})\cup(\mathcal{B}\setminus\mathcal{D})$

In particular:

1. $(\mathcal{A}\cup\mathcal{B})\triangle(\mathcal{C}\cup\mathcal{D}) \subseteq (\mathcal{A}\triangle\mathcal{C})\cup(\mathcal{B}\triangle\mathcal{D})$

2. $(\mathcal{A}\cap\mathcal{B})\triangle(\mathcal{C}\cap\mathcal{D}) \subseteq (\mathcal{A}\triangle\mathcal{C})\cup(\mathcal{B}\triangle\mathcal{D})$

Lemma 10 *Triangle inequalities:*

1. $\mathcal{A}\setminus\mathcal{B} \subseteq (\mathcal{A}\setminus\mathcal{C})\cup(\mathcal{C}\setminus\mathcal{B})$.

2. $\mathcal{A}\triangle\mathcal{B} \subseteq (\mathcal{A}\triangle\mathcal{C})\cup(\mathcal{C}\triangle\mathcal{B})$.

Now we begin to construct $\mathcal{B}_1,\ldots,\mathcal{B}_{2^k-1}$ so that Eq.(45) can be satisfied. The first step is to define sets $\mathcal{E}_i^\ell$. For $i\in[k]$ and $\ell\in[2^k-1]$, define

$$\mathcal{E}_i^\ell := \bigcap_{\substack{\ell'\ge\ell:\\ i\in\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}}} \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}}$$

Clearly, by definition we have $\mathcal{E}_i^\ell \subseteq \mathcal{E}_i^{\ell'}$ for every $1\le\ell\le\ell'\le 2^k-1$.

We construct $\mathcal{B}_1,\ldots,\mathcal{B}_{2^k-1}$ based on the sets $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{S}_1},\ldots,\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{S}_{2^k-1}}$. The key idea of the construction is to obtain that for all ℓ

$$\bigcup_{i\in\mathcal{S}_\ell} \mathcal{B}_i = \left(\bigcup_{i\in\mathcal{S}_\ell} \mathcal{E}_i^\ell\right) \cup \mathcal{R}_\ell\ , \tag{46}$$

in such a way that it is to possible express R_ℓ as a subset of the union of sets $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}} \triangle \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}}$ for $\ell'\ge\ell$. The following lemma states that the construction given in Eq.(46) implies Eq.(45).

Lemma 11 *Assuming Eq.(46) is true, then*

$$\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_\ell} \triangle \left(\bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{S}_\ell} \mathcal{B}_i \right) \subseteq \left(\bigcup_{\substack{\ell' \geq \ell: \\ \mathcal{S}_\ell \cap \mathcal{S}_{\ell'} \neq \emptyset}} (\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}} \triangle \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}}) \right) \cup \mathcal{R}_\ell. \tag{47}$$

Proof Using Eq.(46) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_\ell} \triangle \left(\bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{S}_\ell} \mathcal{B}_i \right) &\subseteq \left(\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_\ell} \setminus \left[\bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{S}_\ell} \mathcal{E}_i^\ell \right] \right) \cup \left(\left[\bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{S}_\ell} \mathcal{E}_i^\ell \right] \setminus \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_\ell} \right) \cup \mathcal{R}_\ell \\ &\subseteq \left(\bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{S}_\ell} \left(\mathcal{U}_i \setminus \mathcal{E}_i^\ell \right) \right) \cup (\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{S}_\ell} \setminus \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_\ell}) \cup \mathcal{R}_\ell \end{aligned}$$

where we used Corollary 9 and that $\bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{S}_\ell} \mathcal{E}_i^\ell \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{S}_\ell}$. Next we claim that for $i \in S_\ell$,

$$\mathcal{U}_i \setminus \mathcal{E}_i^\ell \subseteq \bigcup_{\substack{\ell' \geq \ell: \\ i \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell'}}} (\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}} \setminus \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}}).$$

To see this, first note that

$$\mathcal{U}_i \subseteq \bigcap_{\substack{\ell' \geq \ell: \\ i \in \mathcal{U}_{\ell'}}} \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}}.$$

Thus

$$\mathcal{U}_i \setminus \mathcal{E}_i^\ell \subseteq \left(\bigcap_{\substack{\ell' \geq \ell: \\ i \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell'}}} \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}} \right) \setminus \left(\bigcap_{\substack{\ell' \geq \ell: \\ i \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell'}}} \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}} \right) \subseteq \bigcup_{\substack{\ell' \geq \ell: \\ i \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell'}}} (\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}} \setminus \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}}).$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_\ell} \triangle \left(\bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{S}_\ell} \mathcal{B}_i \right) &\subseteq \left(\bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{S}_\ell} \bigcup_{\substack{\ell' \geq \ell: \\ i \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell'}}} (\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}} \setminus \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}}) \right) \cup (\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{S}_\ell} \setminus \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_\ell}) \cup \mathcal{R}_\ell \\ &\subseteq \left(\bigcup_{\substack{\ell' \geq \ell: \\ S_\ell \cap \mathcal{S}_{\ell'} \neq \emptyset}} (\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}} \triangle \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}}) \right) \cup \mathcal{R}_\ell. \end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

□

To satisfy Eq.(46) we proceed as follows: We initially let $\mathcal{B}_i = \mathcal{E}_i^1$ for all $i \in [k]$. Next, for each $\ell \in [2^k - 1]$, we will simply be adding

$$\left(\bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{S}_\ell} \mathcal{E}_i^\ell \right) \setminus \left(\bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{S}_\ell} \mathcal{E}_i^1 \right)$$

to $\bigcup_{i \in S_\ell} \mathcal{B}_i$, which means that Eq.(46) is satisfied. But now, in order to be able to bound the set $\mathcal{R}_{\ell'}$ for all ℓ' simultaneously, we will do this carefully piece by piece using the ordering of the sets $\mathcal{S}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{S}_{2^k-1}$.

The main step of the construction is this: For $\ell_1 < \ell_2$ such that $i \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell_1} \cap \mathcal{S}_{\ell_2}$, define the set $\mathcal{F}_i^{\ell_1,\ell_2}$ by

$$\mathcal{F}_i^{\ell_1,\ell_2} := \mathcal{E}_i^{\ell_1+1} \setminus \left[\bigcup_{i' \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell_2}} \mathcal{E}_{i'}^{\ell_1} \right].$$

We now define the rank-k solution $(\mathcal{B}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_k)$ by

$$\mathcal{B}_i := \mathcal{E}_i^1 \cup \left(\bigcup_{\substack{\ell_1<\ell_2: \\ i \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell_1} \cap \mathcal{S}_{\ell_2}}} \mathcal{F}_i^{\ell_1,\ell_2} \right) . \tag{49}$$

Let now ℓ be fixed. Then

$$\bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{S}_\ell} \mathcal{B}_i = \left(\bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{S}_\ell} \mathcal{E}_i^1 \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{i \in S_\ell} \bigcup_{\substack{\ell_1<\ell_2: \\ i \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell_1} \cap \mathcal{S}_{\ell_2}}} \mathcal{F}_i^{\ell_1,\ell_2} \right).$$

The following lemma gives the formula of $\mathcal{R}_\ell$ in Eq.(46)

Lemma 12

$$\bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{S}_\ell} \mathcal{B}_i = \left(\bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{S}_\ell} \mathcal{E}_i^\ell \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{i \in S_\ell} \bigcup_{\substack{\ell \le \ell_1<\ell_2: \\ i \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell_1} \cap \mathcal{S}_{\ell_2}}} \mathcal{F}_i^{\ell_1,\ell_2} \right).$$

Thus we can choose

$$\mathcal{R}_\ell = \bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{S}_\ell} \bigcup_{\substack{\ell \le \ell_1<\ell_2: \\ i \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell_1} \cap \mathcal{S}_{\ell_2}}} \mathcal{F}_i^{\ell_1,\ell_2} .$$

Proof When $\ell_1 < \ell$, $\mathcal{F}_i^{\ell_1,\ell_2} \subseteq \mathcal{E}_i^{\ell_1+1} \subseteq \mathcal{E}_i^\ell$, therefore,

$$\bigcup_{\substack{\ell_1<\ell \\ \ell_1<\ell_2: \\ i \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell_1} \cap \mathcal{S}_{\ell_2}}} \mathcal{F}_i^{\ell_1,\ell_2} \subseteq \mathcal{E}_i^\ell$$

And then,

$$\bigcup_{i \in S_\ell} \bigcup_{\substack{\ell_1<\ell_2: \\ i \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell_1} \cap \mathcal{S}_{\ell_2}}} \mathcal{F}_i^{\ell_1,\ell_2} \subseteq \left(\bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{S}_\ell} \mathcal{E}_i^\ell \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{i \in S_\ell} \bigcup_{\substack{\ell \le \ell_1<\ell_2: \\ i \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell_1} \cap \mathcal{S}_{\ell_2}}} \mathcal{F}_i^{\ell_1,\ell_2} \right)$$

On the other hand,

$$\bigcup_{i \in S_\ell} \bigcup_{\substack{\ell \le \ell_1<\ell_2: \\ i \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell_1} \cap \mathcal{S}_{\ell_2}}} \mathcal{F}_i^{\ell_1,\ell_2} \subseteq \bigcup_{i \in S_\ell} \bigcup_{\substack{\ell_1<\ell_2: \\ i \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell_1} \cap \mathcal{S}_{\ell_2}}} \mathcal{F}_i^{\ell_1,\ell_2}$$

Hence,

$$\left(\bigcup_{i\in\mathcal{S}_\ell}\mathcal{E}_i^\ell\right)\cup\left(\bigcup_{i\in S_\ell}\bigcup_{\substack{\ell\le\ell_1<\ell_2:\\ i\in\mathcal{S}_{\ell_1}\cap\mathcal{S}_{\ell_2}}}\mathcal{F}_i^{\ell_1,\ell_2}\right)$$
$$=\left(\bigcup_{i\in\mathcal{S}_\ell}\mathcal{E}_i^\ell\right)\cup\left(\bigcup_{i\in S_\ell}\bigcup_{\substack{\ell_1<\ell_2:\\ i\in\mathcal{S}_{\ell_1}\cap\mathcal{S}_{\ell_2}}}\mathcal{F}_i^{\ell_1,\ell_2}\right)$$
$$=\bigcup_{i\in\mathcal{S}_\ell}\left[\mathcal{E}_i^\ell\cup\left(\bigcup_{\substack{\ell_1<\ell_2:\\ i\in\mathcal{S}_{\ell_1}\cap\mathcal{S}_{\ell_2}}}\mathcal{F}_i^{\ell_1,\ell_2}\right)\right]$$

Since

$$\mathcal{B}_i=\mathcal{E}_i^1\cup\left(\bigcup_{\substack{\ell_1<\ell_2:\\ i\in\mathcal{S}_{\ell_1}\cap\mathcal{S}_{\ell_2}}}\mathcal{F}_i^{\ell_1,\ell_2}\right)\subseteq\mathcal{E}_i^\ell\cup\left(\bigcup_{\substack{\ell_1<\ell_2:\\ i\in\mathcal{S}_{\ell_1}\cap\mathcal{S}_{\ell_2}}}\mathcal{F}_i^{\ell_1,\ell_2}\right)$$

we have

$$\bigcup_{i\in\mathcal{S}_\ell}\mathcal{B}_i\subseteq\bigcup_{i\in\mathcal{S}_\ell}\left[\mathcal{E}_i^\ell\cup\left(\bigcup_{\substack{\ell_1<\ell_2:\\ i\in\mathcal{S}_{\ell_1}\cap\mathcal{S}_{\ell_2}}}\mathcal{F}_i^{\ell_1,\ell_2}\right)\right]$$

Now it suffices to prove

$$\bigcup_{i\in\mathcal{S}_\ell}\left[\mathcal{E}_i^\ell\cup\left(\bigcup_{\substack{\ell_1<\ell_2:\\ i\in\mathcal{S}_{\ell_1}\cap\mathcal{S}_{\ell_2}}}\mathcal{F}_i^{\ell_1,\ell_2}\right)\right]\subseteq\bigcup_{i\in\mathcal{S}_\ell}\mathcal{B}_i$$

Note that by (49),

$$\bigcup_{\substack{\ell_1<\ell_2:\\ i\in\mathcal{S}_{\ell_1}\cap\mathcal{S}_{\ell_2}}}\mathcal{F}_i^{\ell_1,\ell_2}\subseteq\mathcal{B}_i$$

Thus we only need to show that for all ℓ

$$\bigcup_{i\in\mathcal{S}_\ell}\mathcal{E}_i^\ell\subseteq\bigcup_{i\in\mathcal{S}_\ell}\mathcal{B}_i. \tag{50}$$

We prove Eq.(50) by induction that for all $\ell'\le\ell$ we have

$$\bigcup_{i\in\mathcal{S}_\ell}\mathcal{E}_i^{\ell'}\subseteq\bigcup_{i\in\mathcal{S}_\ell}\mathcal{B}_i \tag{51}$$

The base case $\ell'=1$ holds since $\mathcal{E}_i^1\subseteq\mathcal{B}_i$ by definition of $\mathcal{B}_i$, for all i. Let now $\ell'<\ell$ and $i\in\mathcal{S}_\ell$. If $i\notin\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}$ we have $\mathcal{E}_i^{\ell'+1}=\mathcal{E}_i^{\ell'}$, and hence $\mathcal{E}_i^{\ell'+1}\subseteq\bigcup_{i'\in\mathcal{S}_\ell}\mathcal{B}_{i'}$ by induction. Suppose now $i\in\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}$. By induction we have

$$\bigcup_{i'\in\mathcal{S}_\ell}\mathcal{E}_{i'}^{\ell'}\subseteq\bigcup_{i'\in\mathcal{S}_\ell}\mathcal{B}_{i'}\ ,$$

Since $i \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell'} \cap \mathcal{S}_\ell$ we have

$$\mathcal{F}_i^{\ell',\ell} = \mathcal{E}_i^{\ell'+1} \setminus \left[\bigcup_{i' \in \mathcal{S}_\ell} \mathcal{E}_{i'}^{\ell'} \right] \subseteq \mathcal{B}_i \ ,$$

and we can conclude that $\mathcal{E}_i^{\ell'+1} \subseteq \bigcup_{i' \in \mathcal{S}_\ell} \mathcal{B}_{i'}$ in this case as well. Since this holds for any $i \in \mathcal{S}_\ell$, this concludes the proof.

□

Finally, that $\mathcal{R}_\ell$ is a subset of the union of of sets $\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}} \triangle \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}}$ for $\ell' \geq \ell$ can be obtained from the following lemma.

Lemma 13 *Let $\ell_1 < \ell_2$ such that $i \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell_1} \cap \mathcal{S}_{\ell_2}$. Then*

$$\mathcal{F}_i^{\ell_1,\ell_2} \subseteq \left(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell_2}} \setminus \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell_2}}\right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{i' \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell_2}} \bigcup_{\substack{\ell' \geq \ell_1: \\ i' \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell'}}} \left(\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}} \setminus \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}}\right) \right).$$

Proof We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}_i^{\ell_1,\ell_2} &\subseteq \left(\mathcal{E}_i^{\ell_1+1} \setminus \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell_2}}\right) \cup \left(\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell_2}} \setminus \left[\bigcup_{i' \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell_2}} \mathcal{E}_{i'}^{\ell_1} \right] \right) \\
&\subseteq \left(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell_2}} \setminus \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell_2}}\right) \cup \left(\left[\bigcup_{i' \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell_2}} \bigcap_{\substack{\ell' \geq \ell_1: \\ i' \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell'}}} \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}} \right] \setminus \left[\bigcup_{i' \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell_2}} \bigcap_{\substack{\ell' \geq \ell_1: \\ i' \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell'}}} \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}} \right] \right) \\
&\subseteq \left(\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell_2}} \setminus \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell_2}}\right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{i' \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell_2}} \bigcup_{\substack{\ell' \geq \ell_1: \\ i' \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell'}}} \left(\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}} \setminus \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}}\right) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used that $\mathcal{E}_i^{\ell_1} \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell_2}}$ and $\mathcal{U}_{i'} \subseteq \mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}}$ for every $i' \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell_2}$ and $\ell' \geq \ell_1$ for which $i' \in \mathcal{S}_{\ell'}$. □

Combining (48) , Lemma 12 and Lemma 13, we conclude that

$$\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_\ell} \triangle \left(\bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{S}_\ell} \mathcal{B}_i \right) \subseteq \left(\bigcup_{\ell' \geq \ell} \left(\mathcal{U}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}} \triangle \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{S}_{\ell'}}\right) \right)$$

for all ℓ.

Now we summarize the algorithm.

We simply do exhaustive search to find the sets $\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{S}$ for $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{S} \subseteq [k]$, as well as the ordering of the non-empty subsets of $[k]$. Thus the algorithm runs over all selections of indices of columns, $j_1, \ldots, j_{2^k-1} \in [n]$, as well as all bijections $\pi : [2^k - 1] \to \left(2^{[k]} \setminus \{\emptyset\}\right)$. This gives us our ordering of the subsets of $[k]$ (we may place the empty set in an arbitrary position, as the definitions above do not depend on this). Given these, let us denote $\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{A}_{\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{S})}$ for $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{S} \subseteq [k]$. Next we compute the sets $\mathcal{E}_i^\ell$, the sets $\mathcal{F}_i^{\ell_1,\ell_2}$, and finally the sets $\mathcal{B}_i$ as defined above. The algorithm returns the choice of $(\mathcal{B}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_k)$ that minimizes $\mathrm{Err}(\mathcal{B}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_k)$, and this is at least as good as the particular solution analysed above.

For the running time, we iterate over n^{2^k-1} selections of column indices and $(2^k - 1)!$ bijections. For each of these we can compute the sets $\mathcal{E}_i^\ell$ in time $O(k^2 2^k)$, then the sets $\mathcal{F}_i^{\ell_1,\ell_2}$ in time $O(k^2 2^{2k})$, and finally the sets $\mathcal{B}_i$ in time $O(k2^{2k})$. Evaluating $\mathrm{Err}(\mathcal{B}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{B}_k)$ takes time $O(2^{2k}dn)$. Thus the total running time of the algorithm is $O(n^{2^k-1}(2^k - 1)!k^2 2^{2k}dn) = O((2^k + 2)!dn^{2^k})$.

Theorem 14 *The algorithm described above has approximation ratio 2^k.*

Remark 15 *Using the technique of weighted averaging developed for the* GF(2) *model, we can actually improve the approximation ratio to $2^{k-1} + 1$. We omit the details of the proof.*

4 Hardness

In this section we show the rank-1 Binary Matrix Approximation problem is NP-hard under normal polynomial time reduction. We first define two related problems.

Let H be a *complete* bipartite graph with edge weight, and let $\mathbf{W} = (w_{ij})$ be the $d \times n$ matrix consisting of these edge weights. The Maximum Edge Weight Biclique problem is to find a biclique subgraph of H with maximizing total edge weight. As an optimization problem: maximize $\mathbf{x}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{W}\mathbf{y}$, where $\mathbf{x} \in \{0,1\}^d$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \{0,1\}^n$. The Bipartite Max-Cut problem is to find a cut of the vertices of H maximum the total weight of the edges cut. As an optimization problem: maximize $\mathbf{x}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{W}\mathbf{y}$, where $\mathbf{x} \in \{-1,1\}^d$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \{-1,1\}^n$. Note that these two problems differ only in the domain from which $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y}$ are chosen.

Shen, Ji, and Ye [21] observed that the rank-1 Binary Matrix Approximation problem is equivalent to Maximum Edge Weight Biclique when all edge weights are chosen from $\{-1, 1\}$. Namely, if $\mathbf{A}$ is a $d \times n$ Boolean matrix, $\mathbf{u} \in \{0,1\}^d$, and $\mathbf{v} \in \{0,1\}^n$, and let $\mathbf{J}_{d,n}$ denote the $d \times n$ all-1 matrix, we have

$$\|\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{u}\mathbf{v}^\mathsf{T}\|_F^2 = \|\mathbf{A}\|_F^2 - 2\mathbf{u}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{v} + \|\mathbf{u}\mathbf{v}^\mathsf{T}\|_F^2 = \|\mathbf{A}\|_F^2 - \mathbf{u}^\mathsf{T}(2\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{J}_{d,n})\mathbf{v}.$$

Therefore, minimizing $\|\mathbf{A}-\mathbf{u}\mathbf{v}^\mathsf{T}\|_F^2$ is equivalent of maximizing $\mathbf{u}^\mathsf{T}(2\mathbf{A}-\mathbf{J}_{d,n})\mathbf{v}$. Also note that $(2\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{J}_{d,n})$ is a $\{-1,1\}$-matrix. Thus NP-hardness of Maximum Edge Weight Biclique with $\{-1,1\}$ edge weights implies NP-hardness of rank-1 Binary Matrix Approximation. To show the NP-hardness of Maximum Edge Weight Biclique, we consider reduction from the Bipartite Max-Cut problem.

Roth and Viswanathan showed that Bipartite Max-Cut is NP-hard even when all wights are chosen from the set $\{-1,1\}$ [19]. This is done by first showing NP-hardness when the weights are chosen from $\{-1,0,1\}$ and then reducing to the case of weights from $\{-1,1\}$.

Tan showed that Maximum Edge Weight Biclique is NP-hard [24] when weights are chosen from $\{-1,0,1\}$, and shows NP-hardness under randomized reductions when weights are chosen from $\{-1,1\}$. He leaves it as an open problem to obtain NP-hardness under normal polynomial time reductions. The complexity of this problem was also stated as an open problem by Amit [2]

The reduction from weights chosen from $\{-1,0,1\}$ to $\{-1,1\}$ by Roth and Viswanathan and by Tan is similar. The idea is to transform the $n \times n$ $\{-1,0,1\}$-weight matrix $\mathbf{W}$ into a new $nm \times nm$ $\{-1,1\}$-weight matrix $\mathbf{W}'$, where $\mathbf{W}'$ consists of $m \times m$ blocks corresponding to each entry of $\mathbf{W}$. A (-1)-entry is transformed into the all-(-1) $m \times m$ matrix, and similarly is a 1-entry transformed into the all 1 $m \times m$ matrix. But where

Tan transforms a 0-entry to a *random* $m \times m$ $\{-1,1\}$-matrix, Roth and Viswanathan instead transforms a 0-entry into a $m \times m$ *Hadamard* matrix. We will show that this transformation into *Hadamard* matrix also work in the setting of the Maximum Edge Weight Biclique problem, thereby properly establishing its NP-hardness.

Theorem 16 *The rank-*1 Binary Matrix Approximation *problem is* NP*-hard.*

We give a polynomial time many-one reduction from Maximum Edge Weight Biclique with weights from $\{-1,0,1\}$ to Maximum Edge Weight Biclique with weights from $\{0,1\}$, thereby showing the theorem. The proof is based on the following three lemmas.

The lemma below is an adaptation of [19, Lemma 4.2] from the $\{-1,1\}$ case to the $\{0,1\}$ case.

Lemma 17 *Let* $\mathbf{W}$ *be an* $n \times n$ *matrix and let* $m \geq 1$*, and define* $\mathbf{W}' = \mathbf{W} \otimes \mathbf{J}_m$*, where* $\mathbf{J}_m := \mathbf{J}_{m,m}$*. Then*

$$\max_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v}} \mathbf{u}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{W}'\mathbf{v} = m^2 \cdot \max_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{x}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{W}\mathbf{y} \ ,$$

where $\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v} \in \{0,1\}^{mn}$ *and* $\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y} \in \{0,1\}^n$*, respectively. Furthermore, if* $\mathbf{x}$ *and* $\mathbf{y}$ *maximize* $\mathbf{x}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{W}\mathbf{y}$*, then* $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{x} \otimes \mathbf{1}_m$ *and* $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{1}_m$ *maximize* $\mathbf{u}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{W}'\mathbf{v}$*.*

Proof Consider first $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{x} \otimes \mathbf{1}_d$ and $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{1}_m$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{u}^\mathsf{T}(\mathbf{W} \otimes \mathbf{J}_m)\mathbf{v} &= (\mathbf{x} \otimes \mathbf{1}_m)^\mathsf{T}(\mathbf{W} \otimes \mathbf{J}_m)(\mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{1}_m) \\ &= (\mathbf{x}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{W}\mathbf{y}) \otimes (\mathbf{1}_m^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{J}_m\mathbf{1}_m) = m^2 \cdot (\mathbf{x}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{W}\mathbf{y}) \ .\end{aligned}$$

Next, take $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{v}$ maximizing $\mathbf{u}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{W}'\mathbf{v}$. We show that $\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{v}$ can be brought to the form $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{x} \otimes \mathbf{1}_m$ and $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{1}_m$ without decreasing the value of $\mathbf{u}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{W}'\mathbf{v}$. We first fix $\mathbf{v}$ and bring $\mathbf{u}$ to the desired form, and then similarly bring $\mathbf{v}$ to the desired form.

So fix $\mathbf{v}$, and let $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{W}'\mathbf{v}$. Note that $\mathbf{u}$ maximizing $\mathbf{u}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{z}$ must satisfy $\mathbf{u}_i = 1$ when $\mathbf{z}_i > 0$ and $\mathbf{u}_i = 0$ when $\mathbf{z}_i < 0$. Since $\mathbf{W}' = \mathbf{W} \otimes \mathbf{J}_m$ we have that $\mathbf{z}_{jm+1} = \mathbf{z}_{jm+2} = \cdots = \mathbf{z}_{(j+1)m}$ for all $j = 0,1,\ldots,n-1$. Hence we can choose a maximizing $\mathbf{u}$ satisfying $\mathbf{u}_{jm+1} = \mathbf{u}_{jm+2} = \cdots = \mathbf{u}_{(j+1)m}$ for all $j = 0,1,\ldots,n-1$ as well, meaning $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{x} \otimes \mathbf{1}_m$ for suitable $\mathbf{x} \in \{0,1\}^n$. We can now fix $\mathbf{u}$ and in a similar way bring $\mathbf{v}$ to the form $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{y} \otimes \mathbf{1}_m$ for suitable $\mathbf{y} \in \{0,1\}^n$. □

The following lemma, which is the $\{0,1\}$ analogue of [19, Lemma 4.3], is a direct consequence of Lindsey's Lemma. We state the proof for completeness.

Lemma 18 *Let* $\mathbf{H}$ *be a* $m \times m$ *Hadamard matrix. For every* $\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y} \in \{0,1\}^m$*,*

$$|\mathbf{x}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{H}\mathbf{y}| \leq m^{3/2} \ .$$

Proof First note

$$\|\mathbf{H}\mathbf{y}\|^2 = \mathbf{y}^\mathsf{T}(\mathbf{H}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{H})\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{y}^\mathsf{T}(m\mathbf{I})\mathbf{y} = m \cdot \|\mathbf{y}\|^2 \ .$$

We can then complete the proof by the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality,

$$|\mathbf{x}^\mathsf{T}\mathbf{H}\mathbf{y}| \leq \|\mathbf{x}^\mathsf{T}\| \cdot \|\mathbf{H}\mathbf{y}\| = \sqrt{m} \cdot \|\mathbf{x}\| \cdot \|\mathbf{y}\| \leq m^{3/2} \ .$$

□

Lemma 19 *Let $\mathbf{W} = (w_{ij})$ be a $n \times n$ $\{-1,0,1\}$-matrix and let $\mathbf{H}$ be a $m \times m$ Hadamard matrix. Define the $(mn) \times (mn)$ $\{-1,1\}$-block matrix $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}} = (\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_{ij})$, where block $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_{ij}$ is given by*

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_{ij} = \begin{cases} w_{ij}\mathbf{J}_m & \text{if } w_{ij} \neq 0 \\ \mathbf{H} & \text{if } w_{ij} = 0 \end{cases} .$$

Let $\mathbf{W}' = \mathbf{W} \otimes \mathbf{J}_m$. Then for all $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \{0,1\}^{mn}$,

$$\left|\mathbf{u}^{\mathsf{T}}\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{W}'\mathbf{v}\right| \leq n^2 \cdot m^{3/2} .$$

Proof This is by simple estimation.

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\mathbf{u}^{\mathsf{T}}\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{u}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{W}'\mathbf{v}\right| &= \left|\mathbf{u}^{\mathsf{T}}(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}} - \mathbf{W}')\mathbf{v}\right| \\ &\leq n^2 \cdot \max_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y} \in \{0,1\}^m} \left|\mathbf{x}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{H}\mathbf{y}\right| \\ &\leq n^2 \cdot m^{3/2} , \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemma 18. □

Proof of Theorem 16 Suppose now that $\mathbf{W}$ is an $n \times n$ $\{-1,0,1\}$-matrix. Let $m = 2^\ell$ be the smallest power of 2 that is greater than $4n^4$, and let $\mathbf{H}$ be the $m \times m$ Sylvester Hadamard matrix. We then define $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}$ and $\mathbf{W}'$ as in Lemma 19. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \max_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v} \in \{0,1\}^{mn}} \mathbf{u}^{\mathsf{T}}\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}\mathbf{v} - m^2 \cdot \max_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y} \in \{0,1\}^n} \mathbf{x}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{W}\mathbf{y} \right| \\ =&\left| \max_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v} \in \{0,1\}^{mn}} \mathbf{u}^{\mathsf{T}}\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}\mathbf{v} - \max_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v} \in \{0,1\}^{mn}} \mathbf{u}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{W}'\mathbf{v} \right| \\ \leq& n^2 \cdot m^{3/2} \leq \frac{m^{1/2}}{2} \cdot m^{3/2} = \frac{m^2}{2} , \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality is by Lemma 17 and the first inequality is by Lemma 19.
Since the expression $m^2 \cdot \max_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y} \in \{0,1\}^n} \mathbf{x}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{W}\mathbf{y}$ is an integer multiple of m^2, the value $\max_{\mathbf{u},\mathbf{v} \in \{0,1\}^{mn}} \mathbf{u}^{\mathsf{T}}\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}\mathbf{v}$ uniquely determines the value $\max_{\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y} \in \{0,1\}^n} \mathbf{x}^{\mathsf{T}}\mathbf{W}\mathbf{y}$. This then gives the desired reduction. □

References

[1] Noga Alon, Rina Panigrahy, and Sergey Yekhanin. Deterministic approximation algorithms for the nearest codeword problem. In *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques*, pages 339–351. Springer, 2009.

[2] Noga Amit. The bicluster graph editing problem. M.sc. thesis, Tel Aviv University, 2004.

[3] Sanjeev Arora, László Babai, Jacques Stern, and Z Sweedy. The hardness of approximate optima in lattices, codes, and systems of linear equations. In *Foundations of Computer Science, 1993. Proceedings., 34th Annual Symposium on*, pages 724–733. IEEE, 1993.

[4] Radim Belohlavek and Vilem Vychodil. Discovery of optimal factors in binary data via a novel method of matrix decomposition. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 76(1):3–20, 2010.

[5] Piotr Berman and Marek Karpinski. Approximating minimum unsatisfiability of linear equations. In *Proceedings of the thirteenth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, pages 514–516. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2002.

[6] Herbert Fleischner, Egbert Mujuni, Daniël Paulusma, and Stefan Szeider. Covering graphs with few complete bipartite subgraphs. *Theor. Comput. Sci*, 410(21-23):2045–2053, 2009.

[7] Mario Frank, Andreas P Streich, David Basin, and Joachim M Buhmann. Multi-assignment clustering for boolean data. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13(1):459–489, 2012.

[8] Alexander A Frolov, Dusan Husek, Igor P Muraviev, and P Yu Polyakov. Boolean factor analysis by attractor neural network. *Neural Networks, IEEE Transactions on*, 18(3):698–707, 2007.

[9] Harold W Gutch, Peter Gruber, Arie Yeredor, and Fabian J Theis. Ica over finite fields: separability and algorithms. *Signal Processing*, 92(8):1796–1808, 2012.

[10] Dorit S Hochbaum and Anu Pathria. Forest harvesting and minimum cuts: a new approach to handling spatial constraints. *Forest Science*, 43(4):544–554, 1997.

[11] Harold Hotelling. Analysis of a complex of statistical variables into principal components. *Journal of educational psychology*, 24(6):417, 1933.

[12] Peng Jiang, Jiming Peng, Michael Heath, and Rui Yang. A clustering approach to constrained binary matrix factorization. In *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery for Big Data*, pages 281–303. Springer, 2014.

[13] Kari K. Karhunen. über lineare methoden in der wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung. *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fennicae. Ser. A. I. Math.-Phys.*, 37:1–79, 1947.

[14] Mehmet Koyutürk and Ananth Grama. Proximus: a framework for analyzing very high dimensional discrete-attributed datasets. In *Proceedings of the ninth ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 147–156. ACM, 2003.

[15] Claudio Lucchese, Salvatore Orlando, and Raffaele Perego. Mining top-k patterns from binary datasets in presence of noise. In *SDM*, volume 10, pages 165–176, 2010.

[16] Pauli Miettinen, Taneli Mielikainen, Aristides Gionis, Gautam Das, and Heikki Mannila. The discrete basis problem. *Knowledge and Data Engineering, IEEE Transactions on*, 20(10):1348–1362, 2008.

[17] Pauli Miettinen, Taneli Mielikäinen, Aristides Gionis, Gautam Das, and Heikki Mannila. The discrete basis problem. *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng*, 20(10):1348–1362, 2008.

[18] Amichai Painsky, Saharon Rosset, and Meir Feder. Generalized independent component analysis over finite alphabets. *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, 2015.

[19] Ron M. Roth and Krishnamurthy Viswanathan. On the hardness of decoding the gale-berlekamp code. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 54(3):1050–1060, 2008.

[20] Jouni K Seppänen, Ella Bingham, and Heikki Mannila. A simple algorithm for topic identification in 0–1 data. In *Knowledge Discovery in Databases: PKDD 2003*, pages 423–434. Springer, 2003.

[21] Bao-Hong Shen, Shuiwang Ji, and Jieping Ye. Mining discrete patterns via binary matrix factorization. In John F. Elder IV, Françoise Fogelman-Soulié, Peter A. Flach, and Mohammed Javeed Zaki, editors, *Proceedings of the 15th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 757–766. ACM, 2009.

[22] Tomáš Šingliar and Miloš Hauskrecht. Noisy-or component analysis and its application to link analysis. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 7:2189–2213, 2006.

[23] Larry Stockmeyer. The minimal set basis problem is np-complete. IBM Research Report RC-5431, IBM Thomas J. Watson Research Center, 1975.

[24] Jinsong Tan. Inapproximability of maximum weighted edge biclique and its applications. In Manindra Agrawal, Ding-Zhu Du, Zhenhua Duan, and Angsheng Li, editors, *TAMC 2008*, volume 4978 of *LNCS*, pages 282–293. Springer, 2008.

[25] Jaideep Vaidya, Vijayalakshmi Atluri, and Qi Guo. The role mining problem: finding a minimal descriptive set of roles. In *Proceedings of the 12th ACM symposium on Access control models and technologies*, pages 175–184. ACM, 2007.

[26] Leslie G. Valiant. Graph-theoretic arguments in low-level complexity. In Jozef Gruska, editor, *6th Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science, MFCS 1977*, volume 53 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 162–176. Springer, 1977.

[27] Arie Yeredor. Independent component analysis over galois fields of prime order. *Information Theory, IEEE Transactions on*, 57(8):5342–5359, 2011.